

# Historical Collections

## CONCERNING

### CHURCH AFFAIRS:

In which it is shew'd,

From the Ancient Church HISTORIANS, FA-  
THERS, and other Ecclesiastical WRITERS,  
THAT THE

Right to dispose of BISHOPS, purely in relation to their Spiritual Charges, [in their respective Districts,] was believed to be subjected in the Clergy alone, [as a separate independent Body from the Lay Power] during the Reigns of *Constantine* and *Constantius*, [the two first Christian Emperors:] And that it was the Judgment of the Catholick Christians, in those days, if the Secular Magistrature, (or any irresistible Party) did assume the same Right, upon any consideration whatever, that they were not to be [recom'd nor] obey'd in the execution of it.

To which are added,

Some occasional Observations upon Dr. Hody's Book,  
called, *The Cafe of the Sees vacant, by an unjust and uncanonical Deprivation, stated.* [2 1. A 17

[By Simon Loach]

*Jussus a te Episcopos non esse quos condemnare nullus audebat. B. Hilarius, lib. contra Constantium, pag. 201. Ed. Basil.*

En eo intra nos tantum communio dominica continetur, ex quo his perturbationibus vexari ecclesia capta est, ut existeret episcopi, demum Sacerdotes, presbyteri, fides perderetur, humano arbitrio ac Potestate doctrinae divinae decreta fiatant. r.

By a Presbyter of the Church of England.

L O N D O N, Printed in the Year, 1696.

LIBRARY OF THE  
UNION  
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY  
England. —  
NEW YORK.

# Historical Collections

CONCERNING

## CHURCH AFFAIRS

In which is shew'd

From the Ancient Church HISTORIANS, FA-  
thers, and other Ecclesiastical Writers,

THE

Right to dispose of Bishops, partly in relation  
to their spiritual Offices, in their respective Churches,  
was intended to be inserted in the Church, none in  
particular independent of the Roman See, Power, the  
King the Rights of the Church, and the two  
the Church's Roman Emperor, and that it was the  
ment of the Catholic Church, in those days, it was  
Secular Magistrate, or any, we have seen, did allow  
the same Right, upon any consideration, whatever  
that they were, not to be received, nor obey'd in the ex-  
ercise of it.

To which are added,

Some occasional Observations upon Dr. Hey's Book,  
call'd, The Case of the two Churches, by an unlearn'd  
and Dissatisfied Person.

Printed by J. Sturges, at the Sign of the Anchor, in St. Dun-  
stons Church-yard, in the County of Middlesex, in the Year  
1704.

Printed by J. Sturges, at the Sign of the Anchor, in St. Dun-  
stons Church-yard, in the County of Middlesex, in the Year

1704.



Vindication: or, Reflections upon a Pamphlet,  
entitled; Some Discoveries upon Doctor Burnet's  
Book, which is, entitled, The Bishop of Sarum's  
an Sheet into the Printer's hands, there comes out a

**I**T is now somewhat above half an year since the following Papers were finished; and perhaps they may never come abroad, but at the discretion of our Adversaries, though they have now, well nigh gone through the Press: For, why may we not suspect, that they will be seized as well as the learned Vindicator's answer was t'other day, tho' Doctor Hody had dar'd him to make a Reply, and promised him the liberty of the Press, in an unhandsome Letter which he sent him about August last, and it was the only stroke in it that savour'd of decency and good manners: I am apt to think that so great rudeness has not been offer'd to so learned a Man before: and if the Doctor does not make amends to his Reputation, by finding some ways that the Sheets may be restor'd, or by publicly declaring that it is not in his power to have it done, he must, his best friends being judges, leave it in a very low and forlorn condition. But tho' our Vindicator had such ill success, providence so far savour'd us, that when we were putting

## The Preface to the Reader.

*our Sheets into the Printer's hands, there comes out a Book, which is, entituled, The Bishop of Sarum's Vindication: or, Reflections upon a Pamphlet, entituled, Some Discourses upon Doctor Burnet and Doctor Tillotson, occasion'd by the late Funeral Sermon of the former upon the latter, by the Right Reverend Father in God, Gilbert Lord Bishop of Sarum.*

P. 52. *In this Book he tells us, that Dr. Hody has fully ended the Argument he had begun from the Practise of the Church, and that in so convincing a manner, that matters of fact seem'd not to be capable of a clearer proof; and though we pretended other reasons, and make an excuse for not answering him, the true reason why the Book [of the Case of the Sees vacant] is not answer'd, is, because it cannot be answer'd; men may wrangle eternally in Points of Speculation, but matters of fact are severe things, and do not admit of that sophistry.*

*After this he adds, that the Practice of the Church is evidently made out to have been this; that since the Church cannot be kept in order without Governors, when Princes turn out Bishops, tho' upon groundless and untrue suggestions, but without any design to corrupt and alter the Faith, in such a case, the Church is rather to bear a particular injury than to break with the Prince, to forfeit his protection, or to venture on his displeasure,*

### The Preface to the Reader,

pleasure, even in protecting an innocent and injur'd Bishop. Sacred Orders are indeed deriv'd according to the Rules of the Gospel : but the allotment of this or that Bishop; to this or that See, are things of a mixed nature, in which the Civil as well as the Ecclesiastical authority have their share; both are under the Rules of Discretion and Prudence : and the Protection of the Magistrate is of that consequence to the whole, and to the advance of Religion it self, as well as to the quiet and safety of all the Members of that Body, that it is certainly better to bear, even with a particular injustice, then, by opposing it, to venture on a Concussion of the whole Frame. *He goes on, and makes us two challenges; the first is in these words;*

We challenge them to shew us any one Instance, where after a Revolution of the State happened, that was generally receiv'd and settled, the Bishops and Pastors of the Church refused to acknowledge the present Civil Government, and to act in their station under it; and more particularly, where any Revolution happened, which rescued and settled the true Religion, that was not receiv'd with general joy and gratitude, even though the methods of it, and steps of it, were liable to just and great exceptions : we are sure they cannot shew any instance that looks like a precedent to their Proceedings; but that the whole

P. 146, 147.

## The Preface to the Reader.

whole course of History is one continued Precedent in our favour.

The second is in these words; we challenge them to shew us where ever a Schism was formed upon the Lay Deprivation of a Bishop, even when the grounds that it proceeded on were visibly unjust, if the Faith of the Church was not pretended to be concern'd in the matter; more particularly we challenge them to shew us an instance, where the Bishop or Clergy of a Church adher'd to a Metropolitan or a Bishop, to turn'd out, or made a Schism upon his account, when he did not by any publick act or instrument assert his own Right, and challenge the Obedience of those who were subordinate to him.

P. 1, 8. He says farther: That our leaving the general Argument from the constant uninterrupted Practice of the Church, and betaking our selves to the methods of Slander and defamation, is such an evident vindication of a bad cause, and of a worse managery, that it is not possible but that the generality of indifferent Men will soon discern how weak our Reasons, and strong our Passions are: that we have in all our Writings built too much upon the Practice of the Church, to be able with any shame to reject this Argument, and to say, that we ought to be governed by Rules and not by Examples.

In which bold challenges, and most false groundless assertions,



## The Preface to the Reader.

sertions, there are many things unskillfully and untheologically laid down and expressed, and call for a castigation: insonmuch, that if this Vindicator had not, e other day, autoritatively demanded a Recantation from Mr. Altham upon his Licensing the learned Mr. Hill's Book, which he wrote against him on Just Principles; and with sound Reasonings, this his performance is alone a convincing indication that he writes and acts not with the skill of a Divine, but upon raw and indigested Thoughts: or, rather, in the strength of his Peerage, and under the protection of a Writ Called Scandalum Magnatum. I'll divert my self and my Reader a little, in taking notice of two or three of his rash productions.

1. He tells us, that the Church cannot be kept in order without Governors, i. e. without the Secular Power. Pray, how then was she governed, and all things done decently and in order by her own Charter and Officers, in St. Paul's time, and from thence to Constantine the Great, during which space, the Empire was Heathen, and its Secular Arm gave her little or no protection, but with Gallio, its Deputy in the Acts, cared for none of these things? Can we think that our Saviour founded and erected a Corporation with its own Officers and their Subordinates, through the merits and vertue of his Cross, to subsist under it in the time of Persecution, and did not furnish it with just means and abilities to preserve it self, when the Secular Power frown'd, even rag'd, upon it, whether it was then Christian or Heathen?

2. What



## The Preface to the Reader.

What does he mean when he says, that if the Prince offers violence to the Bishop, and turns him out, in such a case the Church is to submit rather than to break with the Prince, and forfeit his Protection? The Church of God stands and acts by vertue of her Charter from Christ: She is thankfull to the Prince for the worldly immunities and protections with which he vests her; but if she be depriv'd of these, either in part, or in the whole, her Charter remains the same, and retains its original force and obligation; and she subsists nevertheless, by the promise and assistance of her Saviour, as she did before any secular donation was bestow'd upon her: her Revenues may not be so large upon it, but her constitution and essential rights, her, even vigor, are not lessened: she neither breaks with the Prince by departing from him, much less by opposing him, nor forfeits, tho' she loses those favours which he had bestowed upon her; but still acts in the same Subordination as to Christ her head in Spirituals, and to the Prince her head in Temporals: neither did she receive one secular donation, but on condition that her Corporation, and the Liberties with which Christ vested it, should receive no abatement, much less a plenary and final abrogation. And it may be farther observed, that as this Vindicator in a few lines before, makes the Churches subsistence, even her frame and being, to depend on the Princes favour, the Concussion of which he mightily fears, and wou'd have every body else do so, upon his displeasure, so he again seems, in the same Paragraph, to vest the Church with an intrinsic

sick

The Preface to the Reader.

sick right of Independency and Non-subordination to him, and to stand upon and execute it, if it be for her advantage. For, what else can be mean, when, having affirm'd the Magistrates Protection of the Bishops to be necessary, he yet owns the Church to have a right to protect an injured innocent Bishop, and to allot a Bishop to this or that See, as well as the Prince, at her own discretion and prudence? And he that will not take this for a self-contradiction, must first make it to appear that these two propositions are compatible, the Church is unable to protect her self, and to subsist without the Magistrate: the Church hath a Power to protect her self, and to subsist without the Magistrate. And, which is worst of all, he allows these Rights, which he, with so much difficulty, asserts to be in the Church, to be sacrificed to the Princes displeasure: and the innocent and injur'd Bishop is no more to be protected, but to be given up, in the time of persecution.

3. He farther shews his loose and indigested Thoughts, when he says; that, the allotment of a Bishop to this or that See is of a mixed nature, in which the Civil as well as the Ecclesiastical Authority have their share; both are under Discretion and prudence. If by allotment he means nomination, or (which was the same in the Ancient Church) Election, his distribution is imperfect; for, the Prince, and Bishop, and People had their share in it, during some time of the Ancient Church, in which the Prince was Christian, and sometimes one of them, sometimes the other, and some-

## 15 The Preface to the Reader.

times all of them jointly, made this allotment: and since he is (at least pretends to be) so strenuous a retriever of the Practice of the Ancient Church, and wou'd to be apprehended to make it his rule, he may not be conceived to take it in this sense, because he seems to allow the People no share in it: I will add, (which in the upstart will mostly prevail with him) since the Laws of our Land have limited the nomination of a Bishop to this or that See to the Prince, and do not allow the Bishop or People to have any thing to do with it. Again, if by Allotment he means Election, as distinct from nomination, as our latter Ecclesiasticks use it; thus the same Municipal Law of our Land places it in the Church and People, but I do not find that the Princes has meddled with it, or pretended to a share in it. Or, if by Allotment he means, the actual vesting of a Bishop with his Spiritual Right in this or that district, or the enthroning him upon his Nomination and Election, the Church Officers only perform this, and the Practice, not only of our own Church, but of the whole Church of God justifies them in it; neither the Prince or People have been concern'd in it, either by the Laws of our Land, or of the Church. This Vindicator therefore ought to have been more carefull in his expression, since, let him take Allotment, in which of the forementioned Senses he thinks fit, he is short, or quite mistaken. But if he confines it to Nomination, as opposed to Election and Enthronization, he evidently brings himself into a Premunire; because he diminishes from the King's Prerogative, making

## The Preface to the Reader.

it a mixed action, and asserting the Ecclesiastical Authority to have a share with him in the Nomination of a Bishop, as it shall be directed by the Rules of Discretion and Prudence.

But I forbear to insist any longer here, lest I should outrun the bounds which I have design'd for this Preface; neither need I take any advantage from these and the like out-works, since the following Collections, which contain the Practice of the Church and Empire in the Reigns of Constantine and Constantius, and Valens and Theodosius in part, do abundantly shew in so convincing a manner, that matters of fact seem not to be capable of a clearer proof, that this Vindicators main Cause is founded on the Sand, and obtruded on Mankind without any precedent in Church History, so far as those reigns do reach, or foundation in things: and that the Empire, then disown'd and remov'd those Rights, in placing a Bishop in his Spiritual Charge within his district, which he pretends it had; and the Church remonstrated upon it, when Constantius once attempted it. So that the whole course of History, within the fore-mentioned interval of time, is one continued Precedent, not in his but in our favour, and it is thence manifest, that as we have not left the general Argument from the constant uninterrupted Practice of the Church, (in the true Ecclesiastical Sense, which concludes the Tradition to be constant and uninterrupted, which is continued for some time, perhaps, by but a few Catholick hands, when a more numerous company of Hereticks and

( a 2 )

Schismatics



## The Preface to the Reader.

Schismaticks trash and interlope it) as this Vindicator  
slanders and defames us; much less that we betake our  
selves to the methods of slander and defamation in-  
stead of it, so it is no less plain that we had no need to do  
it. The meek, and pious, and most learned Vindicator  
of the deprived Sees, yet unanswer'd, is, alone, a just  
confutation of it. But the judicious Reader will find the  
Truths which I shall set down by and by, to be as plain  
and legible in the following Collections, as the Sun is  
visible at noon, in a clear day: each of which are full in  
the Teeth of the Bishop of Sarum's Vindicator, and in  
contradiction to that which he hath, as above recited out  
of his own Vindication, with so much assurance, and  
contempt on us, asserted. And though he cannot, perhaps,  
or will not, yet indifferent Readers will see, that there  
might be other reasons why we have not answer'd Doctor  
Hody, so soon as he thinks we ought to have done, besides  
those which he gives, who makes them our ignorance and  
inability, and because he cannot be answer'd, since  
he will find, that we had just grounds to condemn him: he  
needed not, indeed, have been answer'd now, were it not to  
rectifie and set in their true light those truths and matters  
of fact, which he hath ignorantly and injudiciously involu'd  
and obscur'd, or passed over, or, which is worse, wilfully  
conceal'd. The truths are these that follow; most evi-  
dently prov'd to be such, upon the Principles, and from  
the Practice of the Church, in the Reigns of the two  
first Christian Emperors: the same, in part, being e-  
qually manifested from the succeeding Reigns of Valens  
and Theodosius. As. That



## The Preface to the Reader

That if the Prince should turn out Bishops, and pretend to discharge their People of their Obedience to them, upon what suggestions soever, whether they be true or false, but maintain the Faith unalter'd and unspotted, the Principles of that Age (and its Practice was accordingly, upon each occasion) directed the Church to adhere to the right-ful and innocent Bishops so deprived, contrary to her Laws, and by an incompetent Power, and to chuse rather to venture the Prince's displeasure, and to lose his Protection, and to depend upon her Charter given her by Christ, for her preservation, then to recognize and submit to such a Deprivation.

That as not Sacred Orders, so neither was the Vestment of a Bishop in his Spiritual Right and Charge in this or that See, then lookt upon to be a thing of a mixed nature, in which the Civil as well as the Ecclesiastical Authority have their share, but, as the former, so the latter was to be performed by the Ecclesiastical Authority only.

That the Empire it self then disown'd all right, by which it might be enabled to derive a Bishop's Spiritual Charge on him, or to take it from him, and release his People of their Obedience to him: And, not only so, but, the Empire accounted such an attempt to be profane, impious, unscriptural, and an usurpation; and declar'd the Right of doing it to belong to the Bishop only.

That there was no Revolution in the Civil Government during this interval of Time, and the Query is impertinent, what was then the Churches Practice under a

Revo-

## The Preface to the Reader.

Revolution? But since the then Bishops refused to own and submit to the Emperor's Power in placing and displacing Bishops, though the Emperor was settled there by the Law of the Empire, and not upon a forcible removal of his Predecessor, or a Revolution; since these Bishops then declar'd their unquestionably lawful Governor a Persecutor, the worst of Persecutors; Antichrist and Sacrilegious, upon his doing such a thing; we may safely believe that they would not have recogniz'd and submitted to the same Possession or Deprivation, if it had been made by a Governor placed over them upon a Revolution, when his Title was questionable, but that they wou'd have retain'd those ejected Bishops in the Colledge, and made good their stations, tho' themselves were deprived by him for it, and he had placed a Second upon them. The Bishops of the Church are to keep their Stations, and, so far as their personal liberty enables them, to discharge their Functions under the present Government, be it just or unjust. Christ's Charter requires and enables them to do it: no question can be made concerning it. But the Query is, if the present Government, be it what it will, (it is all one, in this regard, whether it be just or unjust) imposes on them unlawful terms, and, on their non-compliance with these terms disenables them to discharge their Functions, in publick or altogether; whether they are not bound to acquiesce under that disability, rather than take it off, and recover their liberty, by complying with those unlawful terms? But, especially, when the Charter of Christ it self, and that Unity which is essential to it, are in danger to be deliver'd into the hands of the Civil Power, and to be violated by it.

That

## The Preface to the Reader.

That the Catholick Bishops and Pastors of the Church always separated (the Vindicator of the Bishop of Sarum may, in his loose and unthinking way of speaking, when he states cases, call it making a Schism) I say, they always separated from those Bishops that were brought into their Colledge upon a Deprivation, though the Empire had an hand in it, and, at the least, confirm'd it: and the Catholick Presbyters and Believers did so likewise, when the same Bishops were brought into their respective Districts upon the same voidance, whether the Faith of the Church was pretended by them to be concern'd in it, or not: and where the Faith was own'd to be really concern'd, the Schismatical intrust of a Bishop (which was thought to be made when a Lay Hand, though it was a Royal Hand, did it) was believ'd as just a ground for their separation, and to contract as deep a guilt, if he was receiv'd and submitted to, as the heretical imposing a false Article of Faith, if it was embraced and subscrib'd to.

That the then Bishops adher'd to a Metropolitan, or another Bishop, as continuing true Members of their Colledge, or Episcopal Fraternity, and the Clergy and Believers closed with and adher'd to them, as their lawful heads, in their respective Districts, when they were removed from them by a Lay Power that was irresistible; and, not only so, but, when they were banish'd into a remote Land; and, so far as we find in any Church Law which oblig'd them to it, or matter of fact to president them in it, this they did, though these their Bishops had not (sometimes their hard circumstances might be such that they could not) asserted.

### The Preface to the Reader.

asserted their own Rights upon their leaving of them: nor did afterwards challenge the Obedience of those that were Subordinate to them, i. e. such the Presbyters and Believers adhering to them, by any publick Episcopal act, or instrument.

That though the then Catholick Clergy and Believers built the whole frame of their Proceedings in these Cases, as upon the Principles, so, upon the Practice and Authority of the Church, they were not ashamed to say, under some Emergencies, when Persecution was high, and Professors were thin, and to insist upon it, that they were to be govern'd by Rules and not by Examples: and that the rule, not the numerosness of those who shrank from it in the time of distress, was their guid: and they compar'd their case with those of Daniel in the Lyons Den, and the three Children in the fiery Furnace, in respect of their fewness in number. And though this Vindicator wou'd have done it, none in those days, or since, except some few of his complexion, have thought it to be a vindication of a bad cause, and of a worse managery, nor concluded their reasons to be weak, or their passions to be strong by reason of it. Nor will, even, this Vindicator, when he is out of a Party, or any body else, that is unprejudiced, say, that examples, though they be never so numerous, and oitherwise great, have any force or obligation, but (to speak in his own words) when a Foundation is once laid, and a Cause is provided to be just in it self: then the steps of providence that warch over it, will be observ'd by all that are not atheistical and irreligious.

Now,



## The Preface to the Reader.

Now, all this, with a great deal more to the like effect, by which Doctor Hody's whole Fabrick is totally overthrown, being prov'd at large, as in the following Collections upon a sure foundation of Principles, and from as good Authority, as to matters of fact, as any hath been in Christendom, since the Apostolical Writings were penned; I hope we shall be no more upbraided (tho' we may still be condemn'd) for not answering the Doctor's Book of The Vindication of the Sees vacant, as that Book which could not be answer'd. Neither do I know why these Sheets may not also go for an answer to the Vindicator's mighty challenge, in which, with a Spirit too near a kin to that of Goliath of Gath, and in the same Thraasonical way that uncircumcised Philistine did, he bids defiance to the Armies of the living God, through the sides of the little Remnant of the present distressed Church of England, and I expect no handsomer dealings from him hereafter, nor any other return at present than what he hath generally made, for some years past, to other Writings which gall'd him, but he durst not pretend to answer them. As that my Book is a Pamphlet, I have lost my Temper and other Principles with my Benefice: I am ignorant and malicious: let the Reader try his patience on my Book if he can: I may depend upon it, I shall never be answer'd: that my Writings are a disparagement to the side I write for: I am an underworkman; a Journeyman: a bold Scribler, without any sprinkling of Salt to give it a relish: I shall be desir'd to give



## The Preface to the Reader.

over writing : that I am a turbulent Libeller : a distracter of the Church : if they had a mind to make our body to appear ridiculous, they would only wish us to imply such a Writer to make Apologies for us : that my way of managing the most horrid and unnatural Schism, which lies at our door, has made us both odious and contemptible : that my reasons are weak and my passions are strong : that I shew a keenness of spirit which can hurt no body but my self : And, perhaps, I may be called a Knight of the Post, as one is ; because I have publish'd some Truths which this Vindicator and his friend Doctor Hody were ignorant of, and are as unable to bear as to disprove. I had like to have forgotten, that a long Title is another of his Arguments, by which he enervates, in his enervating way, the Learned, Judicious, and most Catholick Tract, entituled, The Charge of the Socinianism against Doctor Tillotson's considered, &c. to which as I am equally liable, so I expect my share of it : but a Brother of his has since convinc'd him that that Book has something in it, and forced a kind of *ibid supra* recantation from him for his beady, rash contempt which he has cast upon it : though his friends Vindication leaves their Pinnacle in the dirt, and does a little more than wash the Ethiopian Skin.

Now, are not these trivial thread-bare Phrases and Expressions fine Arguments to use against several Treatises concerning Schism, and other weighty Subjects, wrote with

## The Preface to the Reader.

as much acuteness, reading, solid judgment, and weight of argument as any controversy has been stated and argued since the Apostles days; the greatest part of which have not yet been pretended to have been answer'd any other way? Which have been wrote, also, with as much temper and candor as any of the ancient Tracts have been? For the, even, Primitive Champions of our Faith and Discipline have still used a great deal of warmth, and never waded any just opportunity of exposing and aggravating the sleights and tergiversations, even, immoralities, of their adversaries, in their own defences and justifications. Though one would think, since this Vindicator has had, very lately, one of his Books burn'd by the common Hangman, by the Order of the House of Commons, and another justly chastised by the learned Mr. Hill, it might have cool'd him a little, and learnt him some tenderness for those Authors, who write, possibly, with a good meaning, but may not perform, in every little particular, so dexterously and advantageously as some others do. It seems, even, his lawn sleeves have not alter'd him, unless for the worse, and he has not attain'd, at least in appearance, more wit or discretion in his representations of things and persons, since he put them on. But let him go on in his way for me; as I have no reason to regard his railery, neither do I fear his strength of argument. And, surely, having lost all I have to lose, I shall not be frighted into a recantation, as Mr. Alcham was. Besides, I am well assur'd that the Authorities which I have produced, and the Temper which I have used in my stile and way of arguing are such, that the

## The Preface to the Reader.

ingenuous Reader will not take offence, though he does dislike the subject matter: and if his great acuteness and discerning judgment should discover some mistakes and failures in the Narrative and Argument, of which I do not pretend to be wholly free, and I will thank him if he gives me notice of them: nor can I think that any one will receive the whole with the Vindicator's Spirit, except himself, and some few more, if there should be any such, who make it their own concern, that Doctor Hody is here prov'd to be an ill Historian, and a weak and fallacious reasoner.

I desire it may be consider'd, that this whole performance is Historical, as the Title speaks it: and if the Doctrines and Practices, of which I give an account, be distastful to the Reader, I hope he will be so candid and just as to pass me by, and lay them at the doors of those who delivered and practiced them: who are no other then the most eminent Catholick Bishops, Confessors and Champions for the Cause of Christ in the Reigns of Constantine the Great and Constantius his Son, with some others a little later in time, but not less eminent, who joyfully suffered the loss of their goods, and sustain'd the banishment of their Persons into remote Countries, and were, moreover, ready to die in the attestation and defence of them, being Martyrs, though their blood was not pour'd out, (for Constantius made no Sanguinary Laws) in the sense of the ancient Church. And I doubt not but that they are such in the acceptance of Christ; nor in the least question but that they have, at this instant, a first place in Heaven, and enjoy a nearer attendance on God there, agreeably to Tertulian's

## The Preface to the Reader.

lian's representation of them, if he was the Author of that Poem.

De ultimis judi-  
cio, cap. 9.

Excelsq; throno celesti sede coruscant  
Martyribus septus.

I'll conclude with the Apology which St. Hilary made in his Book de Synodis adversus Arianos, upon his setting forth the Councils which had been since the Nicene Council.

In quibus si quid vitiosum inesse intelligitur, nemo mihi vitium potest assignare dictorum: internuncius enim sum ipse, non conditor. Si quid vero rectum atq; ex doctrinis Apostolicis deprehenditur: nemo ambigit non interpretantis in eo esse gloriam, sed autoris: ego tamen quæ gesta sunt fideliter transmissi: vos an Catholica, an heretica sint, fidei vestræ judicio comprobate.

THE



---

# THE CONTENTS.

---

## CHAP. I. SECT. I.

**T**HE Author gives his Reasons why these Collections begin with the Christian Empire, and is confin'd to the times of Constantine and Constantius.

The Subject of them is comprized under two general heads.  
As,

1. That during the Reigns of Constantine and Constantius, the forcible removal of a Bishop, by what ways and hands soever it was effected, was not thought to make way for a Successor.

2. That the Empires Right and Power was not then thought to be competent for the abdicating a Bishop, and dissolving the Relation between him and his Subjects, and placing a Successor in his room, and obliging the people to receive him. Page 1,

2, 3, 4.

## SECT. II.

**T**He forcible removal of a Bishop, by what ways or hands soever, was not thought to make way for a Successor, and this is prov'd,

From



## The Contents.

*From the example of Athanasius, Paulinus Bishop of  
ers, Eusebius of Vercellis, Dionisius of Millane, and sev-  
eral others.*

*If the Empire had placed Orthodox Bishops in the Chairs  
of those whom it deposed, the Principles of those times would not  
have permitted the Colledge, Clergy, and Believers to have  
received them.*

Pag. 5, 6, 7.

*For this we have the examples of Eustathius and Meletius,  
Bishops of Antioch.*

*Christians may lose Christ by running away from a true Bi-  
shop to a false Bishop, but never by adhering to their true  
Bishop, though he be in exile.*

*The Antiochian Christians who adher'd to Meletius their  
Bishop, though he was then in exile, are a president for Chri-  
stians therein.*

Pag. 8, 9, 10, 11.

## S E C T. III.

**D**OCTOR Hody's Arguments are confuted, by which he en-  
deavours to prove from the examples of Eustathius and  
Meletius, that Orthodoxy alone will justify a Possessor, tho'  
Heresie will not: and that, when Meletius rejected Paulinus,  
it was because he was reputed an Heretick, or else for other  
warrantable reasons, which his Orthodoxy did not compensate  
for.

P. 12.

*Meletius's Title to Antioch, during Eustathius's life,  
was not founded in Eustathius's deposition which was made in  
the Synod of Gangre.*

*Eustathius was alive when Meletius was made Bishop of  
Antioch, so that Meletius's right to Antioch was not founded  
in Eustathius's death.*

*Eustathius's deposition in the Synod of Antioch did not  
legitimate Meletius's Possession of the Antiochian Chair.*

Pag. 13, 14, 15.

*Though we allow Eustathius's Successors in the Antiochian  
Chair.*

## The Contents.

Chair to have been Arians, and tho he disown'd them for that reason, until Meletius, who was Orthodox, came to his Chair: Yet he had just reason also to disown them, because they were Schismaticks, and came into his Chair by his unjust and uncanonical Deprivation. Doctor Hody's arguing is wide when he concludes, that though their Possession was not warrantable as they were Arians, it was warrantable as they were Schismaticks. Pag. 16, 17, 18, 19, 20.

Meletius's Orthodoxy and Possession did not legitimize him in the See of Antioch, till Eustathius resign'd unto him.

Pag. 21, 22, 23, 24.  
Eustathius's Resignation is a just Pattern for all Christian Bishops, upon the same, or like Emergencies. Pag. 33.

Meletius did not think Paulinus's orthodoxy to legitimize Paulinus to the See at Antioch, of which he was the lawful Bishop, because he was possessed of it, whilst Meletius was in exile; but he received his people, at his return, and presided over them in divine Worship, a part from Paulinus, as from Euzoius, the then Arian Bishop there.

A Bishop that is an heretical Possessor, and a Bishop that is a Schismatical Possessor, are to be shunn'd a like, and a Convention ought to be made in opposition to both of them: tho' it be but in a corner.

It may be believ'd, as Baronius says, that the Bishop of Rome, and the Synod of Alexandria did receive Paulinus as the lawful Bishop of Antioch, without any prejudice to that which we have just now said: since we have reason to believe that they did not then know that Meletius was alive.

Pag. 33, 34, 35.  
The Doctor proceeds upon a sandy bottom; when he pleads, that the Meletians did not refuse Paulinus, as an illegitimate Possessor, but because he did not allow of the Meletian Clergy, as being originally consecrated by the Arians.

Nothing less than the Popes Omnipotent Dispensation, which Baronius pleads, can justify the Doctor, when he asserts Paulinus

## The Contents.

Paulinus the lawful Bishop of the Antiochian See.

Pag. 35, 36, 37, 38.

*It is inconsequential, that tho' Paulinus was justly excepted against, because he was placed in Antioch by Lucifer, who was a Foreigner, and incompetent to do it, he therefore might not be also excepted against, because he was in Intruder upon Meletius.*

*Since Paulinus was in possession, what ever hand gave it him, he had a full Authority, upon the Doctor's principles.*

Pag. 38.

*Catholick Bishops have exercised their Episcopal Functions out of their proper Districts: As Athanasius, Eusebius Vercellensis, Hilary, Eusebius Samosatensis, Eustathius, Gregory the Great, which last, or his Deputy, made Austin Bishop of Canterbury.*

*Our Reformation was, in all likelihood, bottom'd on the same principle, and is hardly, or not so well, justifiable any other way.*

pag. 39, 40, 41, 42.

*The Doctor outdoes his precipitant self, when he insists, that Meletius was received as Bishop of Antioch, and Paulinus rejected from the See, because Meletius was not then disenabled by the Secular Power, to serve as Bishop there, but had the Empire's leave, to return from his exile.*

pag. 43.

## S E C T. IV.

**T**HE Doctrine of passive obedience is mightily exemplified in the practice of Meletius and Eusebius Samosatensis.

*The Bishops of that Age did not teach Mob Doctrines to their people, upon the Governments unjust removal of their persons from them, nor though it suppressed some Article of Faith.*

*They warned them under these and the like exigencies to*

( d )

continue

## The Contents.

*continue in unity under their exil'd Pastours, and to preserve themselves from Schism, as well as from Heresie, and to adhere to the remnant of the Priests, and to exhort one another : And through these practices they had, in Gods good time, their Bishops restored, and their eyes saw their Teachers.*

pag. 44, 45, 46, 47.

## S E C T. V.

**S**ome Observations are made upon Paulinus, Meletius, Flavianus, &c. which will be useful in the present Discourse.

Other reasons besides Heresie are a just ground for a peoples not communicating with a Bishop that is only a Possessor.

pag. 48, 49.

The Church has a power to constitute Districts, and make them fewer or more : even to make two Districts in one and the same City : The Ancient Canon which provides that there be but one Bishop in one City, is not violated by it.

There was a settlement made at Antioch by consent of all Parties, that were concern'd in that See : It was the only way to make peace in that then distracted Church.

pag. 50, 51, 52.

Flavianus and Evagrius soon after broke this unity, which occasioned some new troubles, but God in his good time, and by his own ways, provided for its reestablishment.

pag. 53, 54.

The separation which the Eustathians first made, was not upon the account of the Sophronians Arianism, they did not then profess it, but the contrary : But by reason of their unjust possession.

pag. 55.

The latitude young men, who had been for every Bishop that could get into possession, whether he was an Arian, Homouousian, or an Eusebian, were the Bishops who carried it in the second General Council held at Constantinople,

for



## The Contents.

for Flavianus against the antecedent stipulation, and some, at least, of their most solemn Oaths to the contrary.

St. Gregory chose rather to relinquish his Bishoprick than receive Flavianus, their false Bishop, contrary to the Church Laws.

Doctor Hody makes use of St. Gregory's Resignation to a wrong purpose, when he brings it for a precedent for our deprived Bishops Resignation.

A General Council does not oblige on such proceedings; nor on any, if they be not consistent with the Faith once delivered, relating to Government as well as to Doctrine. The other Apologizes for his staying long upon this head. p. 58. to 68.

---

### CHAP. II. SECT. I.

**D**URING the Reign of Constantine the Great, neither the Emperors right nor power were thought to be competent to abdicate a Bishop, and dissolve the relation between him and his Flock, and place a Successor in his room, and oblige the Colledge and Diocess to receive him.

Constantine disown'd any such Power and Right, as lodged in him, in the case of Cecilianus and Majorinus, when both pleaded their rights to the See of Carthage, and the latter appeal'd to him, as his Judge.

Melchiades Bishop of Rome decided that Case.  
à pag. 68. ad p. 76.

### SECT. II.

**I**N this Section the errors of two sorts of men are corrected.

1. Of those that will have the right of placing Bishops in their Sees, and to displace them, to have been in the Church, so long as the Empire was Heathen, but it devolv'd on the Empire so soon as it became Christian.

2. Of those who say, that the Bishops convey'd their rights

## The Contents.

to Constantine, when he became a Christian, in Composition for his Secular Protection, and for the endowments which he possessed their Bishopricks with, and some other outward Privilege, all which he made Law.

*This Spiritual Power was then solely in the Churches hands.*  
a p. 76. ad p. 79.

### S E C T. III.

**I**N the Council of Tyre, Constantines Secular Ministers acted unseemly in the case of Athanasius, and too much influenced the Bishops, but these only gave judgment there. Constantine did no more in his own right and in his own person then back their Sentence against Athanasius, with exiling him.

Constantine and Cyprian had the same sentiments, and their practice was the same, concerning the rights and power of the Church and State, in relation to Bishops. a p. 79. ad p. 87.

---

### C H A P. III. S E C. T. I.

**T**HE state of the Empire and the Church were the same, as to this affair, in Constantius's days, as it was in Constantines. Which appears.

1. From Constantius's proceeding against Athanasius in the Council of Antioch. p. 87, 88, 89.
2. From Constantius's proceedings in the Council of Sardica and Millane.

Constantius's care that the Bishop of Rome should be present in the Council of Millane, to confirm Athanasius's Abdications in the Synods of Tyre and Antioch does not give the Romanist that advantage he thinks it does. p. 89, 90, 91, 92.

When Constantius assumed the Deposing Power, and in his own name, and the Imperial right, removed Athanasius, and some other Bishops contrary to the Law of the Empire and

## The Contents.

*the Church, Athanasius tells him, that he is an Usurper Antichrist, &c.* p. 93, 94, 95, 96.

Hosius tells him to his face, that he intrudes into Christs Office, and is to be accountable for it at the day of Judgment. other Bishops tell him that he is unrepresented therein, &c.

If these great Bishops did think the fixing, or removing a Bishop, was an indifferent thing, and to be done at the Princes pleasure, why did they suffer rather than comply with Constantius in it? p. 97, 98.

## S E C T. II.

**A** Etian's Arianism was not publicly asserted and professed from the time that it was condemn'd in the Nicene Council, until the second Sirmian Council; nor settled in the Empire by Law, till some time after; and the Catholick Bishops were not opposed and condemned because they asserted the Eternal Generation in any one Council within that interval; but by reason that they opposed and condemned Athanasius and other Bishops unjust and uncanonical Deprivations.

p. 99, 100, 101.

The Euzoian Creed, upon which Arius was received in the Council of Jerusalem did not oppose the Homœousian Doctrine.

p. 102, 103, 104.

The Eusebians did not declare themselves to be Arians in that Council of Antioch, where Eustathius was deposed, but quite contrary.

The Eustathians separated from them because they brought in a false Succession upon Eustathius.

The Eusebians retain'd and professed the Homœousian Doctrine in the Council of Tyre.

p. 105, 106, 107.

They asserted the Eternal Generation in the following Council of Antioch, in which they made four Creeds, they there confirmed Athanasius's Deposition at Tyre for the same reasons it was there made, and for some new ones, but of the same nature.

p. 108.

They asserted it likewise in another Antiochian Creed, in the

## The Contents.

*the Sardican Council, in the Pseudo-Sardican Council in the East: all the World then professed it: even Constantius, Valens and Ursacius.* p. 109, 110, 111, 112, 113.

*An account is given of the various acceptions of the word Arian, within our prefixed distance of time: which is necessary to be considered by all that study this Controversy.* p. 114, 115.

*The Sardican and Pseudo-Sardican Synods did not convene directly about matters of Faith, but concerning the removing of Bishops, each refusing to submit to that Deposition which they conceived to be unjust and uncanonical, tho the Secular Arm concurr'd in it.* p. 116, 117.

*Since the Clergy of Siria and Palestine repented because they had own'd Athanasius's abdication, and receiv'd a Possessor put upon him, if they had likewise consented to Arius's Doctrine, he would certainly have required the same repentance from them by reason of it.* p. 118.

*Their crime was in subscribing to Athanasius's Condemnation, not to Exoukontianism; for which reason the Church refused Communion with them, except upon their repentance.* p. 119, 120.

*The exil'd Fathers of the Council of Millane were not Arians, but they declar'd, notwithstanding against Athanasius's Deposition.* p. 121.

## S E C T. III.

**C**ONSTANTIUS proceedings against Hosius and Liberius shew that not Arianism but Athanasius's and some other Bishop's Abdication was the point then principally under debate.

*The Emperor's right does not extend unto their Spiritual Removal.* p. 121. to 128.

## S E C T. IV.

**I**N the first Sirmian Council the Eusebians declar'd for the Eternal Generation, as they had done in the former Synod. p. 128.

Constantius



## The Contents.

Constantius banish'd Liberius because he would not own a false Abdication and Succession; with which that Age could no otherwise comply then with a false Article. P. 129.

In the second Sirmian Council the Eulebians first declare against the explication of the Homooousian Doctrine; and then assert the Son to be inferior to the Father; to which last Hosius there subscribed: but he repented of it. P. 130, 131.

Church Union and Articles of Faith\* are specificks and have their own entities, both are alike to be contended for, and maintained. P. 132, 133.

A false Union and Succession may not be own'd and embraced, though the Faith is inviolated.

The Prince was not conceived to be able to legitimate an unlawful Succession.

Nothing is more false, then that an unjust Possession legitimates a Bishop, if he be not an Heretick: or is otherwise unexceptionable. P. 134.

The Orientals that afterwards met, first at Ancyra, and then at Sirmium, corrected the Heresies and Blasphemies of the second Sirmian Council, and there asserted the Son to be like the Father in all things, but they dissented from the Antiochian and first Sirmian Councils, in that they anathematized the Homooousian Explication. P. 135.

It is shew'd wherein the difference consisted. between the Homooousians, Eusebians, Semi-Arians, and Exoukontians, or Arians properly so called. P. 136, 137, 138.

The Confirmation of the second Sirmian Creed was recommended by the Eusebians in the Council of Ariminum, but cast out: and the Nicene Faith was establish'd, and those Bishops who opposed it were deposed, by four hundred Bishops. Ibid.

The same Sirmian Faith was, a little after, receiv'd, and the Nicene Faith condemned by the majority of those very Fathers, through the craft and industry of Valens and Ursacius, and Constantius's power.

A remnant remain'd, and asserted the Catholick Faith and Succession, whose memory was perpetuated, and sacred. P. 139.

The Princes Arbitrary Right to remove a Bishop, and constitute

## The Contents.

*tute a Successor is a direct step to the Church's ruine, at his pleasure. The Baroccian MSS. which vests him with such a right, shews the degeneracy of the Greek Church in those times, to an excess.* P. 140.

*When the Eusebians found themselves unable to retrieve their Exoukontianism, and were necessitated to profess the Eternal Generation, they, at length, gain'd the secular Arm on their side, and, through its assistance, sometimes in their false Synods, and now and then in the Emperors right, deprived the Catholick Bishops which stood in their way, but upon pretended crimes which did not relate to Christs eternal Godhead; and they thus obtain'd their ends, and brought their Heresie a broad.* P. 141.

*The Catholicks foresaw the depths of Sathan, and stood by their proper Bishops. All good Christians are to oppose the same practice, and hold to their proper Bishops, when illegally removed.*

P. 142.

*The generality of Bishops in our British Island have lately thought fit to give up their Brethern's Rights, and are therein become so far Desertors of the Ancient Church's practice, to the contrary.*

P. 143.

*The Council of Seleucia so order'd it, that Exoukontianism was there cast out, and the Antiochian Creeds were confirm'd and received. But Acacius farther contrived, that, by Constantius's power, his own Creed was ratified and received in a Synod, which was held at Constantinople, and Arianism appear'd bare fac'd in the World upon it, and was made the Religion of the Empire.*

*The Persecutions which were rais'd before, upon the account of the Bishops unlawful and uncanonical Abdications, and their illegal Successors, which the Catholicks would not own, are now carried on, because they will not declare against the Eternal Generation, and say that the Son is a Creature.* P. 144, 145.

## S E C T. V.

**T***Hose Men mistake matter of Fact within our fixed Epoche, who say, that the Catholicks refused the Successors that were*

## The Contents.

were placed over them, upon an unjust and uncanonical Abdic-  
tion of their proper Bishops, because those Successors were Arians,  
since Arianism was not then professed by them. p. 146.

They all along declar'd, that the unjustness and uncanonicalness  
of their Abdications was the reason that they did not comply with  
them.

Those are strangely mistaken who say, that Arianism was the  
only reason, and their Schism alone would not justify them in it.  
It is not the Schism almost the only reason they gave for it.

Bishop Arsenius, who was one of the false Evidences against A-  
thanasius recanted as a Schismatick, not as an Arian. p. 147 ad. 130.

Since the Catholick Bishops chose to be deprived, and were ready  
for Martyrdom, rather than submit to false Abdications and Suc-  
cessions, tho' they were made by the Secular Arm, it seems  
very plain, that they did not account the receiving or not receiving  
them to be an indifferent thing, which was to follow the will of  
the Prince, or the ordering of an irresistible Power, or present  
Convenience: especially since they rejected them with the same  
aversion, zeal, and constancy, they did reject a false Faith. p. 151.

The Eusebians made, in tract of time, a head against the Do-  
ctrine, by excepting against the explication of the Eternal Genera-  
tion, when they professed it at the same time.

This was another of their artificial steps by which they brought  
in their rankest Arianism: and the Son was generally received as  
a facture, made out of nothing. No one step leads more directly  
to the abolishing the most Scriptural and Catholick Doctrine, if  
the literal sense be once question'd. p. 152, 153.

## S E C T. VI.

**L**iberius's unjust and uncanonical ejectment by Constantius,  
and Felix's Possession of his See, brings advantage to our  
cause, and disadvantage to Doctor Hody's.

During Liberius's banishment, he never own'd nor submitted  
to Felix as Bishop of Rome. neither did the Believers at Rome  
receive him. p. 155, 156, 157, 158, 159.

The two Presbyters, Marcellinus and Faustinus, say, that the  
(d) people

## The Contents.

people of Rome, who were at that time, under a Roman Pontiff, and rejected Felix, as a schismatic, and banishment. p. 161, 162, 163.

The Believers of Rome, who were at that time, under a Roman Pontiff, and rejected Felix, as a schismatic, and banishment. p. 161, 162, 163.

Liberius and the Believers at Rome are acquitted of Schism, the former upon his return, immediately enter'd upon his Bishoprick, and exercis'd his Episcopal function, and the latter received, and communicated with him, notwithstanding that he had then subscribed to Athanasius's Deposition and communicated with the Arians, and their false Successors. p. 164, 165, 166.

Liberius's return without a new Ordination is a demonstration, that his Depose was not, when reputed to forfeit his Orders, nor to require a second Consecration. p. 167, 168, 169.

SECT. VII.

**D**octor Hody's Arguments are considered, which he brings in justification of the validity of Liberius's Deposition, and Felix's Succession. p. 167, 168, 169.

He is in a great mistake, when he says, the Catholics refused Felix, not as a Successor to Liberius, but because they were not satisfied in his Orthodoxy, and he was Ordain'd by Arians. p. 167, 168, 169.

The Doctors Argument from the Oath, which the Clergy are said to have taken to Liberius, notwithstanding his banishment, shews, that he does not understand the true grounds of reasoning. p. 170.

There is nothing more false than his asserting Liberius to have subscribed to Arianism. Liberius was not rejected as Bishop of Rome for that reason. p. 171.

Since the Doctor owns, that Liberius was Orthodox at the time of his Abdication, and two years after; he must own, likewise, that his Abdication was not lookt upon as a competent ground for the Believers Translation of their Obedience, who, notwithstanding, adher'd to him, during that time. If



## The Content.

If they afterwards did reject him as an Heretick, it will only affect us so far, as it is prov'd, that our now-deprived, and, by the many deserted, Bishops are Hereticks likewise.

It was the work of God, in that Constantius brought Liberius back to his people. Liberius died a most zealous Anti-Exoukonian. The Believers constant adhesion to him, before and after his exile was a secondary means of his reestablishment: they are therein, a great example to Posterity, in the same, or the like case. Our expectations are thence strengthened, that God will provide, by the same, or other, means, that our Abdicated Bishops, shall still be own'd, and, in his good time, be restor'd unto us. P. 172, 173.

The Roman Clergy might engage themselves by Oath to Liberius that they would not receive another Bishop, upon his Abdication, and, also, that they would not accept of an Heretical Bishop, that was likely to destroy the Faith. P. 174.

The Doctor's argument, by which he proves, that Felix was a lawful Bishop of Rome, because Damasus once thought him so is trifling. P. 175.

He is not more true to just reasoning, when he argues on, and concludes Felix to be a lawful Bishop, because the Bishops of his own District, communicated with, and received him, as their Metropolitan.

His other Authorities, which he produces, to the same purpose, are no more to be valued than his reasonings. P. 176.

Though Liberius, as the Doctor says, did receive the ordinations which Felix made, it proves nothing less, than that Liberius own'd him as the lawful Bishop of Rome. P. 177.

The Authority of the whole Western Church, which, he says, own'd Felix, to have been one of the true Bishops of Rome, is not cogent either. P. 178.

He does not mend his usual arguings, when he contends, that the whole Eastern Church own'd him as the true Bishop of Rome, because Nicephorus, in his Chronology, has placed him among the Bishops of that See. P. 179.

# The Contents.

## SECT. VIII.

**I**T is shew'd, from a notable Instance, upon the Election of Meletius to the See of Antioch, that, not only the Catholicks, but, the Arians approv'd the bringing a Second into a full Chair, and thought the Second's Title to be invalidated by it: Though the Arians then broke, as all Laws to serve their turn, so, this Church Law, and immediately brought in Euzoius upon Meletius, without an anteceding Church voydance. Doctor Hody may make them his, and his Parties, precedent in it, if he think fit.

p. 181, 182.

It is not so trifling a thing as the Doctor thinks it to be, when men insist on the cancelling a right by those ways it is usually done, but more, especially in the Church, which hath prescribed her own.

p. 183.

It is the duty of a Christian Bishop to be very careful that he does not deliver up the rights of the Church, deposited in his hands, contrary to the end of their commitment to him, though an irresistible Power, even the Emperor with his drawn sword, should demand them of him. Nothing but Church Mens unfaithfulness can betray the Churches rights into forraign hands. The Secular and Spiritual Trusts were accounted at that time, even by Constantius, two distinct things. Nothing less then Eusebius's sense of his obligation from God, could engage him to withhold the latter from Constantius, upon his demand.

The goodness of God has always raised up some choyce Men, in every exigence, who have asserted and maintain'd the rights of his Church: he will always preserve a Remnant for that purpose.

We could not attend the Press as we desir'd to do, which has occasion'd some points to be mis-placed, and other Typographical errors, part of which are here corrected; we hope the Reader will mend the rest with his pen, as he goes along.

**P**ages 1. 42. r. all the Bishops of the. p. 11. 38. for some, r. the same. p. 12. 1. 23. r. pro-  
scription. p. 21. 37. r. ἀπὸ τῶν. p. 51. 19. r. implying. p. 56. 1. 2. r. ἰσχυρῶς. p. 61. 1. 7.  
r. ἰσχυρῶς. p. 62. 1. 2. r. ἰσχυρῶς. p. 71. 1. 20. r. any heed. p. 85. 1. 30. r. bowest. p. 102. 1. 13. r.  
Phanicia. p. 103. 1. 8. r. 1. 2. 3. 4. 5. 6. 7. 8. 9. 10. 11. 12. 13. 14. 15. 16. 17. 18. 19. 20. 21. 22. 23. 24. 25. 26. 27. 28. 29. 30. 31. 32. 33. 34. 35. 36. 37. 38. 39. 40. 41. 42. 43. 44. 45. 46. 47. 48. 49. 50. 51. 52. 53. 54. 55. 56. 57. 58. 59. 60. 61. 62. 63. 64. 65. 66. 67. 68. 69. 70. 71. 72. 73. 74. 75. 76. 77. 78. 79. 80. 81. 82. 83. 84. 85. 86. 87. 88. 89. 90. 91. 92. 93. 94. 95. 96. 97. 98. 99. 100. 101. 102. 103. 104. 105. 106. 107. 108. 109. 110. 111. 112. 113. 114. 115. 116. 117. 118. 119. 120. 121. 122. 123. 124. 125. 126. 127. 128. 129. 130. 131. 132. 133. 134. 135. 136. 137. 138. 139. 140. 141. 142. 143. 144. 145. 146. 147. 148. 149. 150. 151. 152. 153. 154. 155. 156. 157. 158. 159. 160. 161. 162. 163. 164. 165. 166. 167. 168. 169. 170. 171. 172. 173. 174. 175. 176. 177. 178. 179. 180. 181. 182. 183. 184. 185. 186. 187. 188. 189. 190. 191. 192. 193. 194. 195. 196. 197. 198. 199. 200. 201. 202. 203. 204. 205. 206. 207. 208. 209. 210. 211. 212. 213. 214. 215. 216. 217. 218. 219. 220. 221. 222. 223. 224. 225. 226. 227. 228. 229. 230. 231. 232. 233. 234. 235. 236. 237. 238. 239. 240. 241. 242. 243. 244. 245. 246. 247. 248. 249. 250. 251. 252. 253. 254. 255. 256. 257. 258. 259. 260. 261. 262. 263. 264. 265. 266. 267. 268. 269. 270. 271. 272. 273. 274. 275. 276. 277. 278. 279. 280. 281. 282. 283. 284. 285. 286. 287. 288. 289. 290. 291. 292. 293. 294. 295. 296. 297. 298. 299. 300. 301. 302. 303. 304. 305. 306. 307. 308. 309. 310. 311. 312. 313. 314. 315. 316. 317. 318. 319. 320. 321. 322. 323. 324. 325. 326. 327. 328. 329. 330. 331. 332. 333. 334. 335. 336. 337. 338. 339. 340. 341. 342. 343. 344. 345. 346. 347. 348. 349. 350. 351. 352. 353. 354. 355. 356. 357. 358. 359. 360. 361. 362. 363. 364. 365. 366. 367. 368. 369. 370. 371. 372. 373. 374. 375. 376. 377. 378. 379. 380. 381. 382. 383. 384. 385. 386. 387. 388. 389. 390. 391. 392. 393. 394. 395. 396. 397. 398. 399. 400. 401. 402. 403. 404. 405. 406. 407. 408. 409. 410. 411. 412. 413. 414. 415. 416. 417. 418. 419. 420. 421. 422. 423. 424. 425. 426. 427. 428. 429. 430. 431. 432. 433. 434. 435. 436. 437. 438. 439. 440. 441. 442. 443. 444. 445. 446. 447. 448. 449. 450. 451. 452. 453. 454. 455. 456. 457. 458. 459. 460. 461. 462. 463. 464. 465. 466. 467. 468. 469. 470. 471. 472. 473. 474. 475. 476. 477. 478. 479. 480. 481. 482. 483. 484. 485. 486. 487. 488. 489. 490. 491. 492. 493. 494. 495. 496. 497. 498. 499. 500. 501. 502. 503. 504. 505. 506. 507. 508. 509. 510. 511. 512. 513. 514. 515. 516. 517. 518. 519. 520. 521. 522. 523. 524. 525. 526. 527. 528. 529. 530. 531. 532. 533. 534. 535. 536. 537. 538. 539. 540. 541. 542. 543. 544. 545. 546. 547. 548. 549. 550. 551. 552. 553. 554. 555. 556. 557. 558. 559. 560. 561. 562. 563. 564. 565. 566. 567. 568. 569. 570. 571. 572. 573. 574. 575. 576. 577. 578. 579. 580. 581. 582. 583. 584. 585. 586. 587. 588. 589. 590. 591. 592. 593. 594. 595. 596. 597. 598. 599. 600. 601. 602. 603. 604. 605. 606. 607. 608. 609. 610. 611. 612. 613. 614. 615. 616. 617. 618. 619. 620. 621. 622. 623. 624. 625. 626. 627. 628. 629. 630. 631. 632. 633. 634. 635. 636. 637. 638. 639. 640. 641. 642. 643. 644. 645. 646. 647. 648. 649. 650. 651. 652. 653. 654. 655. 656. 657. 658. 659. 660. 661. 662. 663. 664. 665. 666. 667. 668. 669. 670. 671. 672. 673. 674. 675. 676. 677. 678. 679. 680. 681. 682. 683. 684. 685. 686. 687. 688. 689. 690. 691. 692. 693. 694. 695. 696. 697. 698. 699. 700. 701. 702. 703. 704. 705. 706. 707. 708. 709. 710. 711. 712. 713. 714. 715. 716. 717. 718. 719. 720. 721. 722. 723. 724. 725. 726. 727. 728. 729. 730. 731. 732. 733. 734. 735. 736. 737. 738. 739. 740. 741. 742. 743. 744. 745. 746. 747. 748. 749. 750. 751. 752. 753. 754. 755. 756. 757. 758. 759. 760. 761. 762. 763. 764. 765. 766. 767. 768. 769. 770. 771. 772. 773. 774. 775. 776. 777. 778. 779. 780. 781. 782. 783. 784. 785. 786. 787. 788. 789. 790. 791. 792. 793. 794. 795. 796. 797. 798. 799. 800. 801. 802. 803. 804. 805. 806. 807. 808. 809. 810. 811. 812. 813. 814. 815. 816. 817. 818. 819. 820. 821. 822. 823. 824. 825. 826. 827. 828. 829. 830. 831. 832. 833. 834. 835. 836. 837. 838. 839. 840. 841. 842. 843. 844. 845. 846. 847. 848. 849. 850. 851. 852. 853. 854. 855. 856. 857. 858. 859. 860. 861. 862. 863. 864. 865. 866. 867. 868. 869. 870. 871. 872. 873. 874. 875. 876. 877. 878. 879. 880. 881. 882. 883. 884. 885. 886. 887. 888. 889. 890. 891. 892. 893. 894. 895. 896. 897. 898. 899. 900. 901. 902. 903. 904. 905. 906. 907. 908. 909. 910. 911. 912. 913. 914. 915. 916. 917. 918. 919. 920. 921. 922. 923. 924. 925. 926. 927. 928. 929. 930. 931. 932. 933. 934. 935. 936. 937. 938. 939. 940. 941. 942. 943. 944. 945. 946. 947. 948. 949. 950. 951. 952. 953. 954. 955. 956. 957. 958. 959. 960. 961. 962. 963. 964. 965. 966. 967. 968. 969. 970. 971. 972. 973. 974. 975. 976. 977. 978. 979. 980. 981. 982. 983. 984. 985. 986. 987. 988. 989. 990. 991. 992. 993. 994. 995. 996. 997. 998. 999. 1000.

In the Margin. P. 1. 4. r. ὁ δὲ. p. 3. pro H. Socrat. r. Hist. Sacr. p. 4. 1. r. qua. ibid. r. ἡμετέρας. p. 55. r. ἀποτίθεται. p. 71. 1. 24. r. quid. 1. 32. r. jam. p. 74. r. in vita. ἡμετέρας. 77. r. ἡμετέρας. --- ἀποτίθεται. p. 8. ἡμετέρας. p. 84. ἡμετέρας. p. 112. coexist. ἡμετέρας. p. 120. de laude Arbanas. --- de Sanctis. p. 123. r. vitam. p. 171. r. 915.

---

*Historical Collections*  
 CONCERNING  
 Ecclesiastical Affairs, &c.

---

CHAP. I. SECT. I

**I** Have taken some pains, in another Tract, and consulted the most eminent Authorities and Instances in the three first Centuries of the Church; and there found that *the secular Power* is, all along, accounted to have no right in disposing of the Bishops, as to their Spirituals, in their respective Districts and Governments; and that all *Lay-deprivations*, and Successors, or Seconds, pursuant to them, are reputed to be *uncanonical and unlawful*, and were rejected, as such, and no ways to be complied with by the then Bishops and Subjects of the Church; if any such thing should be attempted, as it was not within that period of time: Such power being seated by the *Father* only in the *Son*, and thence derived, by the *Son's* Appointment, to the Apostles and Bishops their Successors, and confined to them until the Government it self shall have an end, and *be delivered up to the Father*.

I have also considered, and ( if I mistake not ) expos'd the Weakness, Inconsistency, and Inconcludingness of *Dr. Hody's* Pleas, Objections and Arguments which he hath thought fit to use to the contrary, in his *Case of the Sees Vacant*, &c. And I once also thought to have made it all publicly agreeably to it's Birthright, as being antecedent in it's composition, and in the order of things to these following *Historical Collections*: But, upon second

B thoughts

thoughts, I have since changed my Mind ; contenting my self, at present, with giving the Reader this little taste of the Doctor's performance upon that Subject : As, *That the Heathen Emperors, tho' Nero's and Dioclesians, had an immutable Right, antecedent to our Saviours, by vertue of which they were fully instructed to depose his Church Officers, as to their spiritual Cares, and appoint their Successors ; and notwithstanding the Son hath received the same Authority, and invested his Apostles, and the Bishops their rightful Successors with it, whatsoever these Bishops should do in pursuance of that Authority, was to be null and wholly repealed at the Will of those Emperors, i. e. Of Rome Heathen, and to give way to their present Orders, even to the quitting them of their Charge and People in regard of Conscience, if so be they deposed them by a coercive Arm, and irretrievably : Nay if any irresistible party did it, it was to be the same in effect ; and the otherwise lawful Bishops stood obliged in Conscience to receive it's force, and acquiesce in it's deposing Sentence : And the want of some such abetting coercive irresistible Arm, was it which made the Novatians, Donatists, and Meletians, Schismatics ; and occasioned the Church of God to condemn them as such. And surely this is hopeful Theology.*

Leaving therefore this lucky Achievement of the Doctor's, so much for the honour and advantage of *Christ and his Church*, to that more full and particular account of it, which the World may have in due time, if God gives me Life and Opportunity ; I continued my Labour, and enquired into the sense and practice of the Church and State when the Empire became *Christian* ; from *Constantine the Great* downwards throughout the best Ages : and I here found also, that not only the Bishops and Doctors, but even the Emperors themselves, within this Interval, did conclude, that the secular, personal, removal of a Bishop from his District, as by Banishment, Imprisonment, &c. whereby he became wholly incapable, or less able for a time, to discharge his Pastoral Function, did not directly, and by it's own force make way for a *Second, or Successor* ; and that no other but Church Hands could effectually depose him, and acquit his People of their Duty to him ; nor upon a just deposition, constitute a *Successor*, and create in him a true Ecclesiastical, I may say, Gospel Right over the Believers, within that District which is truly vacated, in the same measure the Predecessor had it, being justly such ere he was deposed. The Empire, in becoming Christian, had many advantages, as well as the Church ; but it



was not thereupon vested with the Church's *peculium*, (of which her disposing of Bishops in their several districts was then reputed one part) but remained the same (as in other respects, so particularly in that) as whilst it was *Heathen*. And tho' the argument from the practice of the three first *Primitives*, or *Centuries*, is not less demonstrative of this great Truth; yet that of these latter Ages comes nearer to our Adversaries, and shuts up their Mouths more effectually, and does not give them that seeming advantage for the trashing our less thinking Adherents with the trifling Objections the other does. As, *that the Heathen Emperors were ignorant of this Prerogative, or thought it less considerable, or not at all to be regarded, as they did the Christians themselves, and their Religion: What cared they for a Fairy Government, as Mr. Hobbs has since call'd it, and they then thought it to be? And since the Empire did not concern it self with it, who else but the Bishops should manage it, as their Discretion directed them?* But I do here ask these Men, who thus seem to argue, had *Constantine, Constantius, Jovian, Valentinian, Gratian, the two Theodosius's, Honorius*, with other eminent Emperors, the same opinion of it's Regiment in general, or it's Governours, and their Successors in particular? or can they be supposed to have been regardless of their Church Prerogatives? Or to have suffered the Bishops to assume them? Besides, the Church (as the judicious *Ossander*,<sup>1</sup> hath observ'd) \* *Prefat. ad consultat.* under the Reign of these Emperours (*Constantius* only excepted) becomes a thorow President for us in these now *last dayes*; our circumstances being now altogether the same, *under the Nursery of Kings and Queens*: And we are not to plead that disparity we may be allow'd to do, whilst she was in the Wilderness. And these considerations do move me, in part, to recommend to the publick the practices of these succeeding Ages in the first place, as the most likely to prevail upon a lethargick Generation in order to the receiving this great and universal Truth we here contend for; Which hath remain'd as immutable under prosperity, and *when Kings and Queens were nursing Fathers and Mothers to the Church* as under the Cross, and when they were its bitter enemies, and most cruel persecutors.

But in the management of this enquiry I find, that I must confine my self, at present, to two of the forementioned Reigns, *viz.* Those of *Constantine* and *Constantius*, who were the two first Christian Emperors; otherwise this Tract will be bulky and unweildy, both in and out of the Press, and require a greater Purse and

better advantages for the printing and publishing of it, than our present narrow circumstances will give us leave to attain unto, promising if God continue life and health unto me, to go over the rest, and give the World a particular account of them, as relating to our present debate ; and I shall at present follow this method in the doing of it.

I. I shall shew, that during the Reigns of *Constantine* and *Constantinus*, the removing of a Bishop from his District by their own, or any other forceable or illegal hands, tho' rendring him thereby incapable to govern, or so far disenabling him that he *could not* ( in Dr. *Hody's* words ) *exercise his Episcopal Function*, as before, was not reputed, upon Catholick Principles, and by the Catholicks of those Ages, to affect his right, and make way for the placing a *Successor* upon him, as in a Chair which is made vacant upon those terms, which the Church allows.

II. I shall further shew, That, during the Reigns of *Constantine* and *Constantinus*, the Empire was not reputed, upon Catholick Principles, and by the Catholicks of that time ( nor even by most of the Hereticks ) to be vested with a right to abdicate a Bishop, when a *Possessor* ; and by vertue of such his Abdication, or Deposition, to acquit his Subjects of that spiritual Allegiance they owed to him, tho' he was, in his person incapable to exercise his pastoral Function among them : Neither was the Empire understood to be vested with any such Right as to enthrone a Bishop, and rightfully possess him of an Episcopal Chair, tho' it were vacant upon the terms which the Church allows, and by vertue of that possession from his secular Arm, to enable him to demand Obedience of the Officers and Believers within that district, of which he is so possess'd ; nor to lay an obligation on the said Officers and Believers to receive, and obey him ; it being only the Church hands that were then believ'd to be capable of doing it. And farther if any Emperour, or otherwayes illegal power has attempted and effected such a thing ; and so fet up, or depriv'd a Bishop ; a competent number of the Colledge, or Episcopal fraternity, and of under Officers and Believers, that were truly conscientious and Christian, have alwayes remonstrated, upon Gospel Principles, and adhered notwithstanding to the one, and rejected the other.

## S E C T. II.

FIRST of all, then I shall shew, that during the Reigns of *Constantine* and *Constantius*, the removing a Bishop from his district by their own, or any other illegal, forcible hands, tho' rendring him thereby incapable to govern, or so far disabling him, that he *could not* (in *Dr. Hody's* words) *exercise his Episcopal Function as before*, was not reputed upon Catholick Principles, and by the Catholicks of those Ages to affect his Right, and make way for the placing a Successor upon him, as in a Chair which is made vacant upon those Terms, which the Church allows. And of this *Sr. Athanasius* is a full and pregnant evidence, beyond all contradiction; who was forc'd from his Country, and the Execution of his Episcopal Function, falling under the wrath of several potent Emperors; and *Constantine* \* the Great banish'd him into *France*; *Constantius* † his Son made him fly from *Alexandria* by reason of a great Persecution which he rais'd upon him, and the rest of the Catholicks; *Valens* || his wrath was no less cruel to him, upon which he absconded four Months in his Father's Sepulchre; and *Julian* \* first sought his life, and then exil'd him, tho' he repeal'd *Constantius's* Edict against him upon his coming to the Throne. Now, was this great Patriarch er'e the less a Bishop for all this? Did his People think that his violent dispossession any ways impair'd his Right and Title to them, as his Flock; and that not only under *Julian's*, but even under *Constantine's* force and banishment? Did they under these his several absences, or any one of them, pretend that they were quitted of their Subordination to him, and look out for a Successor? Or can *Dr. Hody* prove, That he, *not exercising his Episcopal Power as before, laid claim to their obedience*, by some such publick signification of his will, in the doing of which, the Doctor † says, *our present ejected Bishops* are wanting; and thereby made it known to his People, that he did not resign and give his consent, that a Successor should be acknowledg'd, but retained his Right; whereas ours lost theirs, in giving way to a Successor, by not doing of it? Did even the *Eusebians*, who were his profess'd enemies, and desir'd, and endeavour'd all they could to bring a Successor upon him, and irretrievably depose him, think such a removal made a just and effectual way unto it? If so: Why did they take an ad-

vantage:

\* *Athanas. apol.*2. *Socrat. bist.**Eccl. l. 1. c. 23.*† *Socr. l. 4. c.*2. 8. *Athanas.**Apol. de fugâ,**p. 695. 6, 7, 8, 9.*|| *Socrat. h. 4.**c. 12. Socr. l. 5.**c. 12.*\* *Socr. l. 3. c. 12.**Theodor. l. 3. c. 8.*† *The Case of the Sees, &c. p. 72.*

*Athanas. Apolog.*  
p. 797.

*Socrat. l. i. c. 21.*

† *Athanas. Epist.*  
*ad Orthodox.*

p. 944.

*Socrat. l. i. c. 6.*

vantage of his absence in the *Synod of Tyre*, \* and in shew at least, there depose him? And afterwards in a *Council at † Antioch*, (which was pretended to meet upon another business, to Consecrate a Church) slyly bring in *Gregorius*, as a Successor upon him? All this abundantly shews, that the secular removal was not then thought competent for dissolving the Relation between a Bishop and his People, tho' it was made by *Constantine's* own hand; and that he receiv'd no new Right, which enabled him to do it, by being a Christian; nor was more competent for it than *Trajan*, *Decius*, or even a *Dioclesian* had been before him.

Again, the case of the other Catholick Bishops, who suffer'd with *Athanasius* under *Constantius*, and were remov'd from their Bishopricks (as he had been, in the same cause) by banishment, imprisonment, &c. is no less pregnant an evidence on our side, as of *Paulinus* Bishop of *Triers*, *Lucifer Calaritanus* Bishop of *Sardinia*, *Eusebius* of *Verselli*, *Dionysius* of *Milian*, *Paulus* of *Constantinople*, *Hilary* of *Poitiers*, with *Hosius*, *Liberius*, and many others, all indeed, that would not either submit to *Athanasius's* unjust and uncanonical deposition, or else betray their Faith in the *Eter al Son of God*, by retracting their first Sentences and Declarations in attestation of it, or do both. But did the *Homosians* declare, either that these were the less Bishops for it? Or the less Bishops over those who had been placed in districts under them? Tho' the *Supream Power* was peremptory against them, and had publicly declar'd, that they should govern no longer; and it was impossible that they should exercise their *Episcopal Jurisdiction* as before. Did they look upon their absence as a just voidance of their Sees, or as any ways making room for a Successor? Or did they, thereupon submit to those *Seconds*, whom *Constantius*, or rather his naughty Courtiers, and the *Eusebians* which joyn'd them for that purpose, plac'd in their Chairs? Or, (because the *Doctor* will say, that they refus'd them, because they were not Orthodox, but *Arrians* as he often does in other cases) did they then think themselves oblig'd to look out for new Bishops that were truly Catholicks? We read of no such thing in our Story, but the contrary: And *St. Hilary* in particular gives this account of himself, and his *Episcopal Right*, under his exile, in respect of his fellow Bishops in the *Gallican Churches*, and the Bishops of the Christian World, and his own single district; || I am, saith he, a Bishop in the Communion of all the *Gallican Churches*, and Bishops, and the Christian World, and my own district, distributing

*Com*

|| *Lib. ad Constantium. in itin.* --- *Episcopus ego sum in omnium Gallicarum Ecclesiarum atque Episcoporum communione, si et exilio permanens. Et Ecclesie adhuc per presbyteros meos communionem distribuens.*



*Communion to the Church by my Presbyters, tho' I remain a banish'd man.* His secular and unjust deprivation did not cut him off from the Colledge of Bishops, nor take his own Officers and People from him; but they retain'd their just communion, and dependance upon him, in the things of God, as before. And it is no less evident that the People at *Rome* adher'd to *Libertius* against *Felix*, and the Emperor at once, when he was depos'd by the same violent hand, and precarious authority; of which I shall speak particularly anon. And the truly devout Christians, likewise kept themselves together in a body, as well as they could, in a certain place whither they fled, upon the persecution which happen'd immediately upon the Council of *Ariminum*, when their Bishops were taken from them; and there they remain'd, *not without Christ, when Cephias was in Prison*, and uncapable of acting the part of an Apostle among them, (as the Doctor \* represents us now to be under the like circumstances) but without their Bishops, who had been taken from them, and so much of the outward Ministry as depended upon their personal presence among them: during which time, they had the Ministrations of the Spirit plentifully pour'd upon them by other means, through God's usual mercy to his people in such extremities; and it's Graces and Vertues did so far abound unto them, that they grew highly exemplary in Faith and good Works: For the better preservation of whose Memories to posterity *St. Athanasius*, somewhere in his Works, tells us, that they had a Monument erected. They did not suspect themselves to be under an obligation to take to themselves new Bishops, because their old ones were forcibly remov'd, and their eyes did no longer see them.

\* Pag. 15.

It is ten to one but that *Dr. Hody* will come in here also with his wonderful Argument, and prove, that tho' these Christians cannot be said to have actually disown'd an Orthodox Bishop, put upon them by the Empire, because then it did not think fit to put one upon them; yet they would not have disown'd such a Bishop, if the Empire had thought fit to impose him. But, if we do admit his consequence upon his negative in any other cases, which strangely infers, *That they would receive such a Bishop, because they did not receive him*: It cannot hold in our present *Homonian's* case, since it is well known, that they did then, and their Succession all along, oppose *Novatianism*, in the same degree that *St. Cyprian* had done before them, and the other Catholic Bishops.

\* *Lib. 3. Ep. ii.* Bishops his contemporaries, whose common rule was, \* *one God, one Christ, one Faith, one Bishop* ; and that they enthroniz'd none, but in *loco Petri post Fabiani mortem*, by the Church Rules of Succession, and by Church-mens hands; believing it as much their duty not to enthrone, if upon other terms, as to reject the *Gnostick's Bones, Marcion's two Gods*, and the *Gentiles Polytheism*: As, if God gives me life and opportunity, I shall shew, when I come to give an account of the *Cyprianick Succession*. And those few Catholics, of whom we read, that some time after, and but once, they joyn'd with the *Novatians* in their Publick Prayers, and by consequence, receiv'd their illegal Bishops, when the *Arrian* Persecution was fore upon them, are not therein commendable, nor consequently, exemplary: But of these also I am to speak particularly in their just place.

I will annex the no less fam'd instances of *Eustathius, Meletius, Paulinus, Flavianus* and *Evagrins*, (for tho' the two latter come not at all within the bounds of our fixed Epoche, which ends within the Reign of *Constantius* ; yet their Story will be told here with more advantage) who all of them pretended to be Bishops of *Antioch*, tho' all of them were not truly such ; since an examination of their whole Story, and a faithful representation of it, will not only farther confirm the Truth of our Point in hand, *viz.* That the dispossessing, or local removing a Bishop, does not affect his Right to that Chair, from which he is removed ; nor make way for a *Successor* : but it will also give us an opportunity, and just ground for the clearing several other Truths, which *Dr. Hody* is engag'd to deny and oppose ; but we to assert and defend in the management of our present Debate : tho' he is very confident that the whole Story, and each of it's Circumstances make only on his side ; and thereupon takes a great deal of pains and care in giving an account of it, pursuant to the Design of his *Baroccian Manuscript*. And in the first place,

It will be found apparently manifest from *Eustathius's* case, that the removal of a Bishop, and taking him from his personal care and inspection of his people, by banishment, or any other means, does neither cut off their Relation and Duty to him, nor his Relation, nor right to them ; but they notwithstanding remain his Flock, and he their Bishop. For that great Bishop was banish'd into *Thrace* † by *Constantine*, in the year 329, or 330. and yet was continu'd and acknowledg'd Bishop of *Antioch* by

† *Chrysost. de laud. Eustathij Tom. 5. Ed. Lat. Paris. Et Theod. l. i. c. 27.*

\* Not. in MS.  
Barroccian.

† Ibid.  
|| Li. 4. c. 14, 15,  
Li 6. c. 13.  
\* Case of the  
See, &c. c. 17.  
p. 188.

† De laud Eu-  
stathii, uti supr  
|| pag. 191.

Διὰ ταύτην  
 καὶ τὴν μακάριον  
 ἔσθινον ἀφ' ἧς  
 περὶ τῆς ὑπε-  
 ρβολῆς ὁ Θεὸς  
 ἀπαρχήθη, αἰ-  
 να, μακάριον  
 ἡμῖν εἶναι τὸ  
 δύναμιν τῆς ἀ-  
 ληθείας καὶ τοῦ  
 ἀγαθίου  
 ἀδύνατον μέγα-  
 λον τοῖον  
 περὶ τὸ ἀπο-  
 θνήσκειν ἀεί-  
 ναι, καὶ ὡς το-  
 λιν ποιεῖ τὸ  
 ἀγαπᾶν ὡς ἑ-  
 αὐτόν. Οὐδὲ  
 περὶ τῆς ἐξ-  
 αληθείας ἐξ-  
 βαλλεῖται, καὶ

**C**                      **And**

And the fam'd *Meletius*, who succeeded *Eustathius* in the *Antiochian* Chair, is a no less evident and pregnant proof of the same, when he was banish'd by *Constantius* into *Armenia*, and afterwards by *Valens*: but did he then look upon his People to be less his Flock; or they upon him to be less their Bishop, by reason of it? Did the former thereupon withdraw his Pastoral Care and Instructions, or the latter their filial Duty and Relation? The Doctor is here on our side again, and confesseth, That his people did not look upon the Emperor's Secular Edict to have any influence upon their Bishops Spiritual Right, nor upon their Duty arising from it; but that when *Meletius* return'd from his first banishment under *Constantius*, together with the rest of the Catholick Bishops, by the favour of the Emperor *Julian*, *Lucifer Calaritanus* having consecrated *Paulinus*, and seated him in his Chair during his absence; this \* the greatest part of the Orthodox did not allow of, but ceas'd to receive him as their Bishop, and when their Bishop *Meletius* return'd, adher'd to him; and his own

\* Pag. 192.

† Pastor abigebatur, & oves non dispergebantur: gubernator expellebatur, & scapha non mergebatur: agricola fugabatur & vitis plus fructus ferebat; — non illata tentationes, non impendens pericula, non via longitudo, non diuturnitas temporis, neque quicquam aliud nos potuit disjungere, &c. *Sri. Chrysoft. Hom. de Meletio Antiochen de laude Meletii. Ed. Lat. Tom. 5. Parisi. 1614.*

*St. Chrysoftome*† thus expresseth himself upon *Meletius's* second banishment, by *Valens* into *Armenia*. The Pastor was driven away, and the Sheep were not dispers'd; the Governour was expell'd, and the Ship was not sunk: the Husbandman was put to flight, and the Vine brought forth more Fruit. In short, the Holy Father goes on, and declares, That no temptations, no dangers, neither the length of the way, nor the continuance of time, nor any thing else could disjoyn their daily converse with their blessed Pastor *Meletius*; but he was the nearer to them by his expulsion; and when his body was in *Armenia*, his mind and spirit was daily with them: and on the other side, when they were circumscrib'd

within the confines of *Antioch*, they were flying away in the spirit of love into *Armenia*, beholding there his countenance, hearing his most blessed voice; and that their reception of him, when it pleas'd God to send him again to them, was proportionate; the whole City went out to meet him; some embrac'd his feet, kiss'd his hands, and heard his voice; and those that could not approach him by reason of the multitude, receiv'd equal satisfaction, and the same influences by looking upon him at a distance. I will add, and all this when *Paulinus*, an Orthodox Bishop had been plac'd and receiv'd there; and was in actual possession of his Chair.

† *Socrat. H. E. l. 3. c. 7. l. 5. c. 5. Sec. l. 5. c. 12.*

So great is the tie and obligation between a Pastor and his People, when the relation and dependence is just and true betwixt them:



them: this Love-knot, and Obedience, is so made up, that no force or proscription can dissolve and loose it. The Bishop then is not then depriv'd, and thrust out, *τῆς ἐκκλησίας καὶ τῆς προεδρίας* (in St. Chrysostom's language,) of his Church and Presidency in it, because a strong hand removes him thence; nor the People of their Right in him, or of God's blessings by him, tho' he be in person quite taken away and banish'd from them. Believers may lose *Christ*, by runing from *Cephas* (in his exil'd state) to *Paul*; i. e. from their true Bishop to a false Bishop; but they never lose *Christ*, who resolve to have *Cephas*, i. e. their true Bishop, tho' he be in prison; and refuse a false one. Dr. Hody alone is so unthinking, as to suppose the contrary. \* At least, they shall never lose Christ whilst they keep to that resolution; if they do not fail in other Duties, which are to be it's concomitants and inseparable adjuncts: for a failure in which, a bare recognition of, and outward communion with him will not make a compensation: tho' a firm adherence to their Bishop is an eminent Virtue, and will be in it self always acceptable; and it will always be requir'd of God from them, *Spiritu charitatis*, as the *Antiochians* are said to have discharg'd it to *Meletius*, when he was a banish'd man in *Armenia*, and absent in body from them: they then pursuing him with their love and duty; and retaining, entirely, their subordination to him.

And these two great, and immediately successive examples, so highly and justly extoll'd by † St. Chrysostome, will somewhat † *Homil. de Sancto Meletio.* at least vindicate the practise of a *Remnant* at this day of the *Church of England*, who retain the same heart and affections towards their lawful Pastors, tho' not exil'd into a strange Land, yet under the like restraint, by the Secular Arm, *Eustathius and Meletius* once were. And as our ejected Fathers, the Prelates, do not look upon themselves so to be depriv'd, as to be quitted of their Episcopal Functions, but execute them for their Peoples good, with the same love and care those two excellent Patriarchs did, according to their best opportunities; so their People retain the same dependance upon, and duty for them, the Believers in *Antioch* did for their Bishops; (tho' God knows, as in *Antioch*, so in *England* the *Remnant* is but small) and cease not to love and obey them; tho' they do cease in some conspicuous manner, as some time since, to preside over them. Neither do I question that our Believers and inferior Officers perseverance in so doing, will come short of theirs at *Antioch*, thorough God's same continuance of his

And the sam'd *Meletius*, who succeeded *Eustathius* in the *Antiochian* Chair, is a no less evident and pregnant proof of the same, when he was banish'd by *Constantius* into *Armenia*, and afterwards by *Valens*: but did he then look upon his People to be less his Flock; or they upon him to be less their Bishop, by reason of it? Did the former thereupon withdraw his Pastoral Care and Instructions, or the latter their filial Duty and Relation? The Doctor is here on our side again, and confesseth, That his people did not look upon the Emperor's Secular Edict to have any influence upon their Bishops Spiritual Right, nor upon their Duty arising from it; but that when *Meletius* return'd from his first banishment under *Constantius*, together with the rest of the Catholick Bishops, by the favour of the Emperor *Julian*, *Lucifer Calaritanus* having Consecrated *Paulinus*, and seated him in his Chair during his absence; this \* the greatest part of the Orthodox did not allow of, but ceas'd to receive him as their Bishop, and when their Bishop *Meletius* return'd, adher'd to him; and his own

\* Pag. 192.

† *Pastor abigebatur, & oves non dispergebantur: gubernator expellebatur, & scapha non mergebatur: agricola fugabatur & vitis plus fructus ferebat; — non illata tentationes, non impendentia pericula, non via longitudo, non diuturnitas temporis, neque quicquam aliud nos potuit disjungere, &c.*  
*Sti. Chrysost. Hom. de Meletio Antioch. seu de laude Meletii.*  
*Ed. Lat. Tom. 5. Parisi. 1614.*

*St. Chrysostome*† thus expresseth himself upon *Meletius's* second banishment, by *Valens* into *Armenia*. The Pastor was driven away, and the Sheep were not dispers'd; the Governour was expell'd, and the Ship was not sunk: the Husbandman was put to flight, and the Vine brought forth more Fruit. In short, the Holy Father goes on, and declares, That no temptations, no dangers, neither the length of the way, nor the continuance of time, nor any thing else could disjoyn their daily converse with their blessed Pastor *Meletius*; but he was the nearer to them by his expulsion; and when his body was in *Armenia*, his mind and spirit was daily with them: and on the other side, when they were circumscrib'd

within the confines of *Antioch*, they were flying away in the spirit of love into *Armenia*, beholding there his countenance, hearing his most blessed voice; and that their reception of him, when it pleas'd God to send him again to them, was proportionate; the whole City went out to meet him; some embrac'd his feet, kiss'd his hands, and heard his voice; and those that could not approach him by reason of the multitude, receiv'd equal satisfaction, and the same influences by looking upon him

at a distance. I will add, and all this when *Paulinus*, || an Orthodox Bishop had been plac'd and receiv'd there; and was in actual possession of his Chair.

So great is the tie and obligation between a Pastor and his People, when the relation and dependence is just and true betwixt them:

them: this Love-knot, and Obedience, is so made up, that no force or proscription can dissolve and loose it. The Bishop then is not then depriv'd, and thrust out, *τῆς ἐκκλησίας ἢ τῆς πρεσβείας* (in St. Chrysostom's language,) of his Church and Presidency in it, because a strong hand removes him thence; nor the People of their Right in him, or of God's blessings by him, tho' he be in person quite taken away and banish'd from them. Believers may lose Christ, by runing from *Cephas* (in his exil'd state) to *Paul*; i. e. from their true Bishop to a false Bishop; but they never lose Christ, who resolve to have *Cephas*, i. e. their true Bishop, tho' he be in prison; and refuse a false one. Dr. Hody alone is so unthinking, as to suppose the contrary. \* At least, they shall never lose Christ whilst they keep to that resolution; if they do not fail in other Duties, which are to be it's concomitants and inseparable adjuncts: for a failure in which, a bare recognition of, and outward communion with him will not make a compensation: tho' a firm adherence to their Bishop is an eminent Vertue, and will be in it self always acceptable; and it will always be requir'd of God from them, *Spiritu charitatis*, as the *Antiochians* are said to have discharg'd it to *Meletius*, when he was a banish'd man in *Armenia*, and absent in body from them: they then pursuing him with their love and duty; and retaining, entirely, their subordination to him.

And these two great, and immediately successive examples, so highly and justly extoll'd by † St. Chrysostome, will somewhat † *Homil. de Sancto Meletio.* at least vindicate the practise of a *Remnant* at this day of the *Church of England*, who retain the same heart and affections towards their lawful Pastors, tho' not exil'd into a strange Land, yet under the like restraint, by the Secular Arm, *Eusebius and Meletius* once were. And as our ejected Fathers, the Prelates, do not look upon themselves so to be depriv'd, as to be quitted of their Episcopal Functions, but execute them for their Peoples good, with the same love and care those two excellent Patriarchs did, according to their best opportunities; so their People retain the same dependance upon, and duty for them, the Believers in *Antioch* did for their Bishops; (tho' God knows, as in *Antioch*, so in *England* the *Remnant* is but small) and cease not to love and obey them; tho' they do cease in some conspicuous manner, as some time since, to preside over them. Neither do I question that our Believers and inferior Officers perseverance in so doing, will come short of theirs at *Antioch*, thorough God's same continuance of his

his mercies to them : or that they are less ready to receive their persons with the like demonstrations of duty and affection, the *Antiochians* did *Meletius*, when the same goodness of God shall see fit to reseat them in their Chairs, in their own Persons, or lawful Succession. In which Performances, if the Pastors and People should err, it will be done with great Examples, recommended as such to after Ages : and in good times of the Church.

## S E C T. III.

\* Cap. 17.  
pag. 187, 188.  
Cyc.

I Know *Dr. Hody* will come briskly here upon us, and say, \* *that, Eustathius continu'd Bishop of Antioch, tho' he was locally dispossest by the Secular Arm, and the People of Antioch adher'd to, and recogniz'd him as such; but it was so long as Arian Bishops were in his place; and because there was not in effect any Bishop there, the Possessors being Hereticks: So soon as (by the providence of God) the blessed Meletius came thither (in the words of Chrysostome) who was Orthodox, and he was plac'd in Eustathius's room, as Bishop; Eustathius never after concern'd himself with Antioch; and the same Orthodox party then as readily concurr'd and accepted Meletius, as before they had Eustathius. So that the secular removal of an Orthodox Bishop does not make way for a Successor that is an Arian, or otherways Heretical; but it makes way for a Successor that is Orthodox, and the Believers are to receive him.*

Again, as to *Meletius's* continuing also *Bishop of Antioch* under his prescription, and removal by the secular arm, and his being adher'd to in his exile and deprivation, and receiv'd upon his return, by the Orthodox, tho' *Paulinus*, who was no Heretick, had been possessor there during some time of his absence, and was actual Possessor at his coming home : the *Dr.* thus answers. † 1. *That Paulinus was by some esteem'd not Orthodox, but a Sabelian. 2dly. He did not allow the Ordinations of the Meletian Clergy; and that was enough to make them oppose him. 3dly. Lucifer Calaritanus, who constituted him Bishop there, had nothing to do with the See of Antioch: What authority had he to constitute a Bishop at Antioch? Had Meletius been dead, the Church of Antioch would not have been oblig'd to submit to Paulinus, whom he made Bishop. If an outlandish Bishop, that had nothing at all to do here, should pretend to Consecrate an Archbishop of Canterbury, in the room of a banish'd Archbishop; who can imagine, that by the Principles which we advance, we should be oblig'd to receive him? 4ly. Meletius was not at that*  
time

† *Ibid.*



time in banishment, not made incapable of serving as a Bishop of Antioch : he was so far from being made incapable by any Sovereign Power, that by the Emperor's authority he had leave given to return to his See ; and was, as it were, upon the Road. And what is more divers than the Case of these, and our present ejected Bishops ? Is any one of their Successors an Heretick ? Or their Ordainers ? Or but under suspicion of Heterodoxy ? Or does any object against their Consecrations ? Did an outlandish authority place them in their Sees ? Or were they under the Inhibition of the Secular Arm ? Did they not enter on their Sees by the leave of a Sovereign Power ? And are they not there actually fix'd by it's Authority ? And can they pretend a president in Antioch for their not communicating with them ? The Doctor is very well assur'd that they cannot : tho' I do not doubt but to make it appear, that he has no true grounds for it ; and I shall to that purpose answer him, as follows. And in the first place.

1. I do not pretend to found *Meletius's* Title to the See of *Antioch* upon *Eustathius's* first deposition from the See of *Sebastia* by his own Father *Eulalius* : or his second deposition, which is said to have been executed against him in a Synod at *Gangre* in *Paphlagonia*, upon Articles exhibited against him; of which we have an account in *Socrates's* \* and *Sozomen's* † *Church-Histories*. This \* L. 2. C. 32. † L. 3. C. 13. made use of to prove *Meletius's* Title to the See of *Sebastia*; the † L. 4. C. 23. two foremention'd Historians telling us, || that he was next to || *Socrat. l. 2.* *Eustathius* in that Chair : But I cannot see how it can justify his † L. 3, 33. Title to the Church of *Antioch*, tho' he there also succeeded *Eustathius*; for he did not come thither as Bishop of the place till † *Soz. l. 4. c. 24.* many years after, but was first made \* Bishop of *Bærea* in *Syria*, \* *Socrat. c. 33.* where it seems he likewise succeeded † *Eustathius*. And besides, *ibid. ut Supra.* *Sozomen* || says, That *Eustathius* did retract those errors for which he † *Soz. l. 1. c. 2.* was depos'd by the Synod. So that he might have a just right to || *Ibid. l. 3. c. 13.* his Bishopricks of *Bærea* and *Antioch*, notwithstanding his first recidivation and censure upon it: and whatsoever his demerit and incapacity was before, we may be sure that he had abundantly expiated, and remov'd it, ere he was admitted to either, or both of them, by a plenary repentance and satisfaction. And tho' it was a just ground, before his repentance and purgation, for his deprivation at *Sebastia* ; it was no bar, it could not be one, to his Titles to *Bærea* and *Antioch* ; especially since we find him afterwards so far from lying under the Church censure, or any incapacity for the Work of a Bishop, that he was translated from the

\* Theodor. l. 1.

c. 7.

Soz. l. 1. c. 2.

† Soz. l. 2. c. 17,  
18.

|| Hom. de laude  
Eustathii.

\* Non enim e-  
ventus solo, sed  
etiam voluntate  
Martyrii corona  
comparatur.  
Ibid.

the See of *Brerea* to the See of *Antioch*, \* by the consent of all the Bishops, Presbyters, and People; and the unanimous Act of the first Council of *Nicaea*, in which he eminently appear'd as a Member: and he is all along † represented to have been a stiff opposer of the *Arian*, and most zealous maintainer of the *Homoſian* Doctrine: He that deſires his Character, may have it at large from St. *Chryſoſtome*, || both as a Biſhop and a Chriſtian; whom he calls a Martyr, tho' he died in his Bed: \* For the Crown of Martyrdom is not obtain'd by the event only, but by the will alſo. If *Eufſathius* had been Synodically depoſ'd, and juſtly; and continu'd by the Church under that interdiction, and had been, whiſt under its cenſure, veſted with the Primacy of *Antioch*, his title had been nominal only; and *Meletius* would have been the true Primate of that See, entring upon it upon thoſe Terms which the Church allows, tho' *Eufſathius* had then been alive; but ſince, tho' once diſabled in a former See, he had been reſtor'd, and his cenſure had been taken off, and he was plac'd in *Antioch* by Church hands, and Laws; *Meletius* could have no right in that See, at the ſame time he was in it, by reaſon of *Eufſathius*'s depoſition and cenſure; but could be only a *Second*, in St. *Cyprian*'s ſenſe, i. e. an intruder; or, which is the ſame thing, Dr. *Hody*'s Poſſeſſor only, in claiming a Right, and exerciſing Epiſcopal Jurisdiction there. Again.

2dly. Neither will I pretend to have *Meletius*'s rightful poſſeſſion of the *Antiochian* Chair to be founded in *Eufſathius*'s death; tho' betwixt it and *Meletius*'s enthronization, no lawful Biſhop had been plac'd there, at the time of that Solemnity; as thoſe, who plead it for *Meletius*'s legitimation, do aſſert. For, tho' his death would have taken away the objection of two Biſhops in the City, upon *Meletius*'s admittance, and obviated ſo much illegality and guilt, as it would otherwiſe have contracted; and ſince *Meletius* was Orthodox, and admitted by thoſe other Rules, which the Church requires, (we'll ſuppoſe, at leaſt, he was) nothing but *Eufſathius*'s being alive at the time of his admittance could illegitimate his Chair, and make it adulterous: Yet his death cannot be prov'd from authentick hands, or thoſe collections and inferences which will be demanded to make it good. And indeed *Socrates* and *Sozomen* are ſo particular in their Narratives, where-in they repreſent him to have been alive, at the time when *Meletius* came to the *Antiochian* Chair, and are backt with ſuch corroborating Authorities, and Circumſtances in Church Story, that  
it

it may not be denyed upon full thoughts and a just consideration of them. As, that he was call'd from his Banishment by \* *Jovian*, and was at *Constantinople* in the Reign of *Valens*, where he then Consecrated *Evagrius* Bishop of that City; The *Homosians* taking an opportunity to fill the Episcopal Chair, upon the death of *Eudoxius* the *Arian*, who had usurp'd it: and both *Evagrius* and *Eustathius* were afterwards banish'd for it by *Valens*, the latter into *Bithinia* in *Thrace*, and the former into another Forreign Region. But especially (besides many other which the Doctor himself has collected, and we may safely stand by) in that *St. Chrysostome* tells us, that he was living when *Meletius* was made Bishop of *Antioch*; and exercis'd his Episcopal Function in that district, until his coming thither; whose account of it I have a little above recited. And the single Authority of *Theodoret* † hath not weight enough to carry the Scale against all these; nor the reason and conjectures which *Baronius* || and *Valesius* \* thence take occasion to give for his being dead; Tho' they were great Men in their times, and Observations: It being manifest that they came short in this particular.

3ly. I cannot think either, That *Eustathius's* Deposition, which was made by the Council of *Antioch*, whilst he was made Bishop of that See, of which we have an account in *Socrates* \* and *Sozomen*, can make a just plea for *Meletius* to that Chair, and Legitimate him as a Successor there. For the Bishops in that Council, who were mostly *Eusebians*, condemn'd him, in truth, for his great and experienc'd zeal and performances against *Arianism* || in the Council of *Nicaea*; tho' they did not implead him for it, (it being too early days,) but, partly as a *Sabellian*; (the *Arians* usually arraigning the *Homosians* as such, they frequently also call'd them \* *Phorinians*, *Montanists*, &c. *Athanasius* had his share of it) and the crime which they ultimately insisted on, was his suppos'd incontinency; but they had not competent evidence to make good their Accusation: And all the truly Orthodox Bishops in the Synod † Protested against their Proceedings. Neither may we believe that *Eustathius* himself, who was so great and eminent a man, in his life and death, being recorded as a Saint and Martyr, would have wrote, and continu'd himself Bishop of *Antioch*; That the Orthodox would have made separate Meetings, and Communicated under, and recogniz'd him as their lawful Bishop; That he would act as such, and pre-

\* *Socrat. lib. 4.*

c. 10.

Soz. l. 6. c. 13.

† *H. E. l. 3. c. 4.*

|| *ad. An. 370.*

pag. 244.

\* *Annot. ad l. 4.*

*H. E. Sect. c. 14.*

15.

\* *I. I. c. 18.*

† *l. 2. c. 18.*

|| *Arban. Apol.*

p. 702. 812.

*Hieron. in Chron.*

\* *Philostorg.*

*Epir. Hist. Eccl.*

*Sandius Mistor.*

*Enucleat.*

† *Theod. H. E.*

l. 1. c. 22.

side over them, tho' in Exile, until, by an agreement between them, and his Resignation, *Meletius* was rightfully placed in that See; That the *Eastern* Church should depute him, with two more Bishops, as their Legates to *Liberius*, \* to let him know, that they did then acknowledge, and always would unto death, the *Nicene Faith*; and the Doctrine of one Substance; That he should be receiv'd as a Bishop of *Christendom*, upon other special occasions, as by the Orthodox at *Constantinople*, and be made use of by them for the || Consecrating *Evagrius*, and advancement of the Catholick Doctrine; That the Orthodox at *Antioch* should all along be call'd *Eustathians*, by a Denomination from him: This (I say) cannot be believ'd, if he had all this while been legally abdicated, and remov'd upon the terms which the Church allows, and had liv'd and dyed under it's Censure. As for those that say there were two *Eustathius's*, the one of *Sebastia*, and the other of *Antioch*; and that he of *Antioch* was not the Legantine Bishop from the *East*, and did not consecrate *Evagrius* at *Constantinople*, but he of *Sebastia* did both: I cannot be any ways affected with it, as to our present Argument; (tho' upon a thorough enquiry they may be found to be in a mistake) since those against whom I advance it, do contend but for one, which is he of *Antioch*, and that it was he who perform'd those Offices. Besides, if *Eustathius* had been actually and truly depos'd, and the Orthodox had deem'd him to be, and remain so, how came it to pass that they did not Elect another in his room, but let the See continue vacant till *Meletius* was enthron'd, which was, at least, thirty years after, during some part of which time it was fill'd with *Arian* Bishops, profess'dly such, and from the beginning with those whom the *Arian* contagion had deeply infected, but it appear'd not so publickly as afterwards? as we read in *Theodoret* † and I shall make more plain anon. This is contrary to the Practice of the Church in those times, which still continu'd a Succession in opposition to the *Arians*: And since she did not do it here, we are to believe it was because she knew the See to be fill'd by *Eustathius*, till *Meletius* was made Bishop there: And consequently did not look upon *Eustathius* Abdication to be made on true Church grounds and to be effectual.

If it be replied, how came it then to pass that *Constantine* did own and abet *Eustathius's* Abdication with his secular Arm, and banish'd his person, (it may be believed) upon his non submission

\* *Socr. l. 6. c. 10.*  
 † *Socrat. l. 4. c. 11.*

|| *Socr. l. 4. c. 13.*

† *l. c. 22.*



submission to it? To this it may be replied, that upon a thorow inquiry into his behaviour in that whole affair concerning *Arius*, it will be found, that His Majesty, was little better then a Trimmer from the beginning, in his own Inclinations : And believed that the sense of the *Homousian* Doctrine might be received without the Synods explication ; But especially without making it Law : though his piety directed him to receive, enfranchise, and submit to it. And he might in his latter days ( when this Scene, in which *Eustathius* had so great a part, was acted ) be over yeilding to the *Eusebians*, who carried it in the Synod, in which *Eustathius* was condemn'd, and there pretended to be Catholicks, but with a naughtier Design ; *Viz.* That they might effectually overthrow the *Nicene* Doctrine by it. And if not at the same time, it was not long after, that the \* *Arian* Presbyter had *Constantine's* favor to a great degree : And first prevail'd with him to recall *Arius* : With the same *Arian* Presbyter, 'tis asserted, that Emperor left his last Testament, and Enjoin'd him under Oath, to deliver it with his own Hand, to his Son *Constantius*. And as this Presbyter had great advantages for the promoting his Religion, and it had success accordingly under *Constantius*, so we are not to question, but that he insinuated notions into *Constantine*, which he had not at first received : Though the Actions of Princes, in some particulars, have always been unaccountable.

\* L. 2. c. 32.

4ly. But to come closer to the Doctors own Arguings : What he contends for, in these following words, may in part be granted him : *Viz.* ' That *Eustathius* and the Orthodox Party, did not own and receive the *Second*, or *Successors*, which were placed in the *Antiochian* See, upon his Banishment, until *Meletius* was Enthron'd who was Orthodox ; Because before his Admission, such *Seconds* were accounted *Arians* : But then *Eustathius* gave over, and never concern'd himself any more as Bishop of *Antioch*, being secur'd of an Orthodox *Successor*. But though we do grant that this was one reason, and at that time, their only reason, which they produced : yet might they not have separated, as they then did, and made their Conventions under other Bishops, whom they believed to be legal, and given some other account of it, which was justifiable, upon those terms which the Church stands engag'd to accept ? What if that Succession that was placed upon *Eustathius* was not *Arian* ? And some || contend it was not : Of which I am hereafter to give an account.

† Pag. 188.

|| Baron an. 340.

(Supposing what the Doctor and we at present allow, *viz.* That *Eustathius* was not deposed under *Constantius*, but under *Constantine* the Great, it will then be more then probable that it was not *Arian* ) and what reason will the Doctor then leave for *Eustathius*, and the Orthodox People of *Antioch* to give ( admitting that he was duly deposed ) why they renounced their Communion, and he govern'd, and they assembled under him in opposition to that Succession? He must conclude them to have been Schismaticks in the doing of it : But then he will own, that there is another reason over and above that of Heresy, (especially *Arianism* ) which justify's a separation. And surely (be the Doctors Opinion what it will,) they might have done it, purely and solely, because that Succession was Schismatical and brought in upon *Eustathius* whilst he was alive, and vested with the Government of the *Antiochian* See, upon Church terms : As the Doctor allows he was, till *Meletius* came thither : at which time, and not before, he says *he gave over* : But nothing is more sure, than that the Principles and Practices of the Church of God would have born them out in it, for that consideration; which have all along oppos'd *Novatianism* in the same degree, and with the same zeal, they have oppos'd *Arianism* : And the Characters of each, as of the Heresy, are still found to be given by the Ancient Church, with the same detestation : And it is also most manifest, that the same Ancients have oppos'd *Novatus*, by reason of his Schism, and for that he brought in Bishops upon full Sees, which were not voyded by Church Laws, to the disturbance of the peace and quiet of the Church of God. And did not *Arius* do the same? Or, was he less a Schismatick than *Novatus*, because he was more an Heretick, and consequently, less hateful, and to be avoyded for it? And I do not in the least question; but that *Eustathius* would no more have comply'd with *Meletius* upon his forcible and uncanonical coming to the See of *Antioch*, had he indeed come to it in such a manner, than he did with *Sophronius* and his Succession; supposing them to have been *Arians* : Or that even *Meletius* did account his Orthodoxy, alone, sufficient to vouch his Succession, without *Eustathius*'s leave, and Resignation. Both which I shall fully make appear by and by. Neither do we find, that the Church has been less careful to continue, and maintain, her Succession against *Novatianism*, than she has been against *Arianism*. The Doctors reason may be good which he gives, why *Eustathius* and the

Orthodox

Orthodox at *Antioch* did not submit to that Succession, founded in *Sophronius* : (Who was the first *Eusebian* Bishop that came in his Chair) but he makes a perverse improvement of it, when he thence insinuates, or rather directly infers, that the Schism alone of the *Sophronians*, had not been a just ground of their separation from them : As though if they had not been *Arians*, the *Eusebians* wou'd have compli'd notwithstanding *Eusebius* was invalidly depos'd, and at the same time a rightful Proprietor, but forcibly remov'd by *Constantine*, and illegally by the Synod, as they afterward did, when *Meletius* came into the See, with *Eusebius* his leave.

But this is the Doctors constant way of arguing : And he all a long prov's, with a great deal of weakness and fallacy ; that because the Empire hath by its own Authority, without a Synod, placed Bishops in full Sees, not voyded by the Church Laws, but only by its secular removal of the proper Bishops, and the Orthodox have refus'd to receive and submit unto them, and given this reason for it, *Viz.* Because they were *Arians* : Therefore (he wou'd infer) these Catholics wou'd have received the same intruded Bishops or others, in the same Circumstances, if they had been Orthodox ; and the Schism of the action, and their being *Seconds* in a full See upon an anteceding Church right, not justly extinguished, would not have made a defensive plea, nor justified their non Communion with them. But, might he not as well have argued, that, because adultery is declared to be a sin, which will forfeit that mans salvation who commits it, therefore, Perjury, Drunkenness, Witchcraft, &c. are not such noxious sins as Adultery is, because they are not always upon the same occasion, and at the same time, declar'd to have the noxious effect, but pass'd over and not mention'd, because the Judge thinks fit to arraign and condemn a Criminal as a Traytor, who at the same time, is known to him to be a Felon, Murderer, Sodomist, &c. But he doth not think fit to arraign and condemn him for them, at that Assize, therefore the Criminal is not arraignable, nor lyable to be condemn'd upon those scores ? The Doctor himself tells us that *Acacius Patriarch of Constantinople refused to Communicate with Timothy Ælurus, not because he was put into the place of Timothy Salofaciolus, unjustly deposed by the Herretical Usurper Basilicus, but because he was an Heretick and a Paricide.* Now, what if his Murder had not been mention'd there, as well as his Heresy ? Why the Doctor, by the parity

\*Cap. 5. Sect. 4.

of Arguing, must have concluded, that, not his Murther, but his Herefy only, had been a just ground for *Acacius's* rejecting him. But then, he must conclude likewise, that, as not Schism, so, neither were Symony, Idolatry, &c. just ground for it, since they are not mentioned neither : And thus he that arraigns but one sin, at one, and the same time, as damning, must be interpreted to acquit all the rest, though of the same, or the like malignant Influence. And is not this pretty Arguing ? But his Book is stuff'd with the same or worse : And we have it heaps upon heaps throughout a great part of it. He ought to have prov'd, that a Bishops Schismatical Possession, upon a bare secular *Deprivation*, is not a just plea for the Believers not Communicating with him, as well as his *Arianism* ; which he can no more do, than he can prove ; because *Arianism* is a most wicked Herefy, therefore Schism brings no guilt with it. But in that he proves the Schismatical possession, not to be a just Plea, because there are more just Pleas, and but one of them is, upon a special occasion, produced as a just one, when that of Schism is not mention'd together with it ; this argues only the Doctors rash head, and unthinking Complexion. When a Criminal is brought to the Bar, who is guilty of many Offences that are Capital, the Judge's prudence will direct him to single out one of them, against which the Evidence is most full, and when it's punishment will be more exemplary, and conduce, at least, under the present circumstances, in a greater measure to the common good : And we may easily think, that the same Prudence did direct our Orthodox Believers, in a proportionable degree, to insist upon the *Second's Arianism*, ( admitting that they did insist only upon it, which is not prov'd ) as the reason why they refus'd to Communicate with him, it being a sin which did then, when the Doctor produces these instances and reasons of it, as visibly appear as the Sun at Noon day, to the no less manifest destruction of the Church, by its Heterodoxy in Faith, and ill effects upon manners, being fill'd with Sacrilege, Rapine, and all sorts of Injustice, which swallow'd up the Schism, and Church Usurpation. And though the Schism had been a competent Plea in its self ( and the Catholick Church did at that time no more submit to *Novatianism* than to *Arianism* ) yet the *Arianism* might be thought a more seasonable Plea, (*Novatianism* being then Indulg'd by the Empire and made Law, and its abettors, in some other respects, had gain'd a tolerable reputation with

the

the Catholicks) as like to prove a better, and more effectual advocate for them : and if any that profess'd to be Orthodox have clos'd with, and submitted to the Schism, when not complicated with the Heresie, the Doctor must prove that they did it upon Principles and Conscience, otherwise his telling of Stories (of which he has abundance) will prove nothing.

5. As to that which the Doctor says, viz. *That Meletius's Orthodoxy, was it which gave him a rightful Title upon his Possession; and accordingly, Eustathius and the Orthodox at Antioch received him as their lawful Bishop, so soon as they were secured of it.* I shall shew : That as *Meletius's Arianism*, during his Profession of which he was Consecrated \* Bishop of *Antioch*, would have been a competent and undeniable bar to his own rightful Possession of that Chair, if he had not contrary to the expectation of *Eudoxius* and others, who promoted him as an *Arian* into it, retracted that Heresie, and profess'd himself a Catholick; and neither *Eustathius's* deposition, resignation, or death would have removed that bar : So that it was not his Orthodoxy alone, and possession, which made him the legitimate Pastor there, till *Eustathius* gave way unto him, and upon composition, resign'd his Right into his hands: but without it, he would have been no better than *St. Cyprian's Second*: i. e. he would have been a Schismatick, and not a lawful Bishop there, so long as *Eustathius* continued alive, and a Synod did not remove him, upon terms which the Church allows. And this will be readily done, in parts, from the account of *Eustathius's* relinquishing that See, and *Meletius's* receiving of it, which the Doctor has given us out of *St. Chrysostome*, and I have recited from his Transcript, a little above, in this Section: Where it is most evident, that *Eustathius* continued to inspect and govern the Orthodox in *Antioch*, and they their dependance on him, as their Bishop, until *Meletius* came thither; that *Eustathius* did not own *Meletius* as the Bishop of *Antioch*, till it pleased God to bring him off from his *Arianism* [ὡς ὁ Θεὸς παρεκίνησας] and he became a Catholick; that his Orthodoxy alone, and Possession (which the *Arians* gave him) did not create his full and just right, until *Eustathius* desisted, and gave up his jurisdiction to him [πείθειν ἀπέστη] by resignation; and he then, and not before, became the lawful and compleat Pastor of *Antioch*, [ἐλθὼν τὸ πνεῦμα ἀπ' αὐτοῦ λαβεῖν—ἡμεῖς ἔλθον ἐθίγειν] and received the whole Mass, and reaped; and the Flock, which before was *Eustathius's*, became *Meletius's* Fold and People. And all this

\* See. l. 4. c. 27.  
Baron. ad. 360.  
num. 44. 45.



\* P. 138.

† B. M. S.  
Barn.

is very well consistent with that which the Doctor \* tells us is observ'd by Photius, Patriarch of Constantinople, which is in a Treatise not yet publish'd, but to be met with in the Oxford Library: † as that Meletius being advanced to Eustathius's Throne, when he was banish'd for his Piety, and still living, prov'd no prejudice to him: but because he was Orthodox, he was readily receiv'd by the Church: For though it was in consideration of Meletius's Orthodoxy that Eustathius resign'd to him; Photius does not say, that his Orthodoxy alone gave him a title to the See, and that it was in it self, though accompanied with Schism, competent to do it; and Eustathius's resignation was not requir'd in order to it. The Doctor wonders, that neither Baronius, nor Valesius (he might have added, nor the vindicator) observ'd this passage in Chrysostome, and so do I: and much more that Baronius mis'd it; since he has given us some account of Meletius, out of St. Chrysostom's Homily, de sancto Meletio Antiocheno; and that his industry did not lead him a little further, to the Homily de sancto Eustachio Antiocheno, where the above-mentioned Narrative is to be found: the two being still placed not far from one another in those Editions of Chrysostome, which I have met with. And I cannot but wonder that the Doctor should commit a greater oversight, and be so inconsiderate as to say; That the Orthodox Party very readily concurr'd and accepted Meletius, being an Orthodox Bishop, though it does not appear, that they knew that Eustathius would give his consent; for, how can he think that they were, or could be, ignorant of it: since their own eyes and ears were their evidences for it: did not their own Bishop Eustathius, who all along before, from the time of his banishment, had applied himself to take care of them, and called them together, and exhorted them not to yield to Wolves, or betray the Flock to 'em, when they invaded the Sheep, he did not leave 'em: (in the words of the Doctors own translation of Chrysostome) did not Eustathius (I say then wisely desist to take the same care of them any longer, and (for I cannot tell how to express it otherwise) resign his Right and Jurisdiction to him, when by the providence of God the blessed Meletius came thither? Nor can we think that Meletius did not receive Eustathius's resignation in the same visible manner; unless we can suppose these Orthodox Believers of Antioch, who had so firmly and conscientiously adher'd to Eustathius, under his state of abdication, would not once ask him the reason why he desist'd; but arbitrarily desert him at the last; that they should satisfie their consciences

in

† P. 191.

in doing of it ; or, that *Eustathius* should not give them his reasons for it ; or, in the last place, that *Meletius*, who was at that time brought off, by the goodness of God, from *Arianism*, should remain so great a Novice in the Catholick Polity, as to be ignorant (I shall shew you by and by, that he was not ignorant) that his Orthodoxy alone was sufficient to legitimate his possession, whilst *Eustathius* was alive, without his consent and resignation? *Eustathius's* bare desisting ought to satisfy the Doctor that he did resign : if he be not a meer *Sceptrick*, who contends only for a present Argument ; since he tells us ; that in reason we ought to presume, that our ejected Bishops did give their consent that their Successors should be acknowledged, because, (since their ejection, he must be supposed to mean) they have never, by any publick signification of their will, laid claim to the obedience of their People, and do not now exercise their Episcopal Jurisdiction, as before. It is true, *Eustathius* did act as a Bishop after his resignation : but it was not as Bishop of *Antioch* ; neither did he lay claim to the obedience of that people any more than to another : but he acted as a Bishop of the whole World : *De quarvis in toto orbe Constituta Ecclesia*, as *St. Chrysostome* † speaks ; (of which Episcopal Right, I am to speak more anon,) who tells us ; that he took care of the Christians in *Constantinople*, under the *Arian* Persecution, being recall'd from banishment by *Jovian*, and continuing in that City : at which time he also ordain'd *Evagrius* Bishop there, and they both were banish'd for it by *Valens*, as we read in *Socrates*, ‖ and ‖ *H. E. l. 4. c. 13.* possibly he might perform an Embassy to *Liberius*, from the *Eastern* Church, if that was not another *Eustathius*, as *Baronius*, thinks he was, who perform'd it. But if the Doctor will stand by his own Argument no longer than it serves his turn, and reject what is here produced as an incompetent proof of a resignation ; and at this day require *Eustathius*, *Meletius*, and their *Antiochians* Original Contract, with their Hands and Seals to it ; I do own that I am unable to do it : and I am so much the less concern'd for it, because I am not in *Westminster Hall*, but in the Church, where such proof is not required.

Besides how can any man think that the Catholicks in *Antioch* who adher'd to *Eustathius*, notwithstanding that a Council there had depos'd him, they believing his deposition to be unjust and null ; and form'd themselves into a Party upon it, and were call'd *Eustathians*, in opposition to *Sophronius*, who was placed in *Eustathius's* Chair, and lookt upon by them as a *Second*, and in-

truth

LIBRARY OF THE  
UNION THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY  
NEW YORK

\* *Cap. 3. S. 2.* truder : and continued their separation from him all along in his succession, only because he was a *Second*, and possessed a See, to which he had no right; for the *Eusebians* then professed the *Doctrine* of the Eternal Generation, as in the *Nicene Creed*, as I shall make it appear \* anon; so that the *Eustathians* could not plead their *Arianism*, as the reason of their separation; tho' it is ten to one but Doctor *Hody* will say they did: can we (I say) think, that these same *Eustathians* would have received *Meletius* into the Chair of *Antioch*, and paid him their duty, as their lawful Bishop, which all men, even the Doctor owns they did, *Eustathius* being then alive, and filling that See, with the same justice he had filled it, from the time of his enthroning; if he had not resign'd it, and quitted his right to *Meletius*, and thereby made way for their admission and acknowledgment of him, upon Church terms? We cannot think it: For what else could *Meletius* be otherwise but a *Second* in *Antioch*, as *Sopbronius* was? Which way could he come into the *Antiochian* district, but by the same injury, which the *Sopbronian* Succession had before done to *Eustathius's* right and person? How infamous must these *Eustathians* be, upon their entertaining *Meletius*, who filled the See with the same injustice *Sopbronius* did? But they embrac'd the one, and separated from the other, they may not be thought to have done it, without *Eustathius* his consent, and voidance of the Chair, some way or other, if not by a formal resignation, openly made known unto them; especially if we consider their practice a little after; whom we find to adhere to *Meletius*, upon a principle of right, when he had been a long while forcibly absent, and *Paulinus* was brought into his See, without his consent, and regular relinquishment of it; though *Paulinus* was not thought to be an *Arian*: they did not believe his Orthodoxy to be sufficient to justify his coming into a full See, and unlawful Possession, any more than they believed *Meletius's* possession in opposition to *Eustathius*, or the *Sopbronians*, in opposition to both of them, was their warrant for it.

I will here add; that this generous and most Christian action of *Eustathius* seems to have been, in some measure, a president to that proposal which † *St. Austin* and the *African Bishops* made in the days of *Honorius*; who, upon the growth of *Donatism*, and after many attempts and conferences for the adjusting the differences arising upon it, betwixt the *Donatists* and *Catholicks*, tender'd this offer, viz. that if upon a just stating of their respective rights,

† *Ep. ad Marcel. apud August. l. de gestis cum Emerito donatist.*

rights, the lawful title should appear to be with the *Donatist*, would resign their Bishopricks to them. And the distressed *Greek* Patriarchs seem to have imitated them both; in that they have sometimes resign'd their Patriarchies to those Bishops of their own Faith, whom their hard Masters thought fit to nominate, least their Religion and its Orders should be wholly suppressed, upon their refusal, or less protected. Did not this great Bishop of *Antioch*, *Eustathius*, act much after the same manner before them? Did he not first quit, τὰς τιμὰς τῶν ἀρχόντων (in *St. Chrysostome*, as above cited) the Honours of a Governor, when he retain'd the Episcopal Office, and the cares of it, whilst his People were among Wolves, and in the hands of *Arian* Successors, and afterwards relinquish his right also to the Orthodox *Meletius*; himself being then in exile, and less capable to serve that People than *Meletius* was? Tho' *Meletius* did not long enjoy that liberty which he then possessed. And surely, he is not a truly Christian Bishop that will refuse to do the same, under the same, or the like circumstances; but refuses to resign, though the Church may enjoy thereby those advantages, which it cannot have, if he does not: though it be otherwise in danger of ruine: neither on the other side is he a truly Christian Bishop, who quits his Rights and Government, into the hands of its enemies, when they are either *Schismatics* or *Arians*: which was the case of *Eustathius*, who upon that consideration refused for some time to do it: or when they are purely obstinate *Schismatics*, which was the case of *St. Austin*, and the *African* Bishops; and it was upon that account they did not resign: but of this by the way: to return then where we left off: In the next place,

6ly. *Meletius* will be found a farther full and pregnant instance, that the Church in those days, did not allow Orthodoxy, and possession upon it, to make a passable title, whilst the Predecessor was alive, and not duly remov'd; since we have not only prov'd *Meletius* to have received a resignation from *Eustathius*, ere his title could be just and compleat to the See of *Antioch*; but we farther know him not to have own'd *Paulinus*'s title to the same See, though he was Orthodox, and in possession of it, and himself, the first and proper Bishop, was, at the same time, personally abdicated; being remov'd by exile from it: but when he return'd, by the favour of the Empire, and found *Paulinus* in his Chair, who had been seated there by *Lucifer Calaritanus*, he declar'd himself to be Bishop of that place notwithstanding: and

E

received

\* *Socrat. l. 3.* \* that had adhered to him, and disown'd *Paulinus*, as well as  
*c. 11.* *Euzoius*: which latter was the *Arian* Bishop, (who had been in  
*Sox. l. 5, c. 11, 12.* *Antioch* from the time of *Meletius's* absence, and set up, in oppo-

sition to them both) tho' *Meletius* was forced to officiate with them in the Suburbs only, when *Paulinus* was permitted to have his Altar in the City, by that favour which was denied *Meletius* by *Euzoius*. And we are hence to observe, which will corroborate what we have just now offer'd in proof of *Eustathius's* resignation,

*First*, That *Meletius* whose Character is so great in the Church for Orthodoxy and Integrity, cannot be thought to have insisted on his Orthodoxy alone, upon his possession as a just qualification, and competent title to the See of *Antioch*, without *Eustathius's* resignation; since he did not allow of *Paulinus's* claim to the same, upon such terms: for *Paulinus* was an *Eustathian* (which sect was entirely Orthodox) and in possession, as *Eustathius* had been before him; we have shew'd it to be highly probable, that *Eustathius* resign'd, otherwise the *Eustathians* would not have deserted him, and accepted *Meletius* for their Bishop: which is further prov'd by little less than a demonstration, since none may think, that *Meletius* would have oppos'd *Paulinus* as a possessor without right, when at the same time, himself had been no better than a bare possessor in the See of *Antioch*, with equal injury to *Eustathius*, as he pretended *Paulinus* was to him; unless *Eustathius* had resign'd unto him: if *Paulinus's* title was not good against *Meletius*; *Meletius's* title was not good against *Eustathius*, except upon *Eustathius's* resignation, or his voluntary voidance of his right in *Antioch*, by some way which was equivalent to it.

*2dly*. That it is no new thing for a holy and religious Bishop to summon his people, and convene with them, in the worship of God, though it be in some remote and obscure place, when he is overpower'd by Schismatics and Hereticks, and they shut up against him, those Houses of God, that are assign'd in his City, and District, for that purpose, as *Euzoius* the *Arian*, and *Paulinus* the Schismatick, did then upon *Meletius*.

*3dly*. That *Meletius* and his Catholics, did separate, and keep their worship apart, in respect to *Euzoius* and *Paulinus* alike, and as the Heresie and Schism of the former (for the *Arians* were not only Hereticks but Schismatics) so the Schism alone of the latter, was adjudg'd by him as a just cause, and sufficient war-

rant



rant for his doing of it : *St. Cyprian's Second*, or a Bishop that is an illegal *Successor*, and a Bishop that is an Heretical *Successor*, are both to be shunn'd : and we stand engag'd not to acknowledge, nor to communicate in subordination to the one, as much as to the other : the true Catholick Succession was then preserv'd and continued, in opposition to both the *Arian* and *Novatian* Succession : and will be contradistinct to Heresie and Schism, to the World's end : tho' it may be less pompous and visible, many times ; and in a corner.

I know, that *Baronius* contends for *Paulinus* as a legitimate Bishop, upon every occasion in his *Annals* : and for the putting it out of all doubt that he was such, he tells us that *Lucifer Calaritanus* did constitute him Bishop of *Antioch*, as the Pope's Legate : but he says it in the *Index* of his fourth *Tome*, which refers us to *pag. 176.* where he has not one word of it, nor doth he attempt to prove it any where else : neither is he singular herein ; it being the usual precarious way of the *Romish* Doctors, to place their Pope in the head, and represent him as the *primum Mobile* of every action that seems considerable : and we will grant the great and excellent *Annalist*, that the Bishop of *Rome* did receive *Paulinus* as a Bishop of *Antioch*, as also the Council of *Alexandria*, according to the account which *Athanasius* gives of it, in his *Synodical Epistle ad Antiochenos* ; which Epistle he hath recited at large, and truly in his *Annals* : \* where it also appears, that *Athanasius* \* *An. 362.* and *Eusebius Vercellensis* did the same : the former † exhorts the † *Eph. ad An.* *Antiochians* to unity with *Paulinus*, as their Bishop : but *Sozomen* *tiobenses.* † tells us, that *Meletius* was not then return'd from his exile : † *L. 5. c. 11.* ( which is omitted by \* *Socrates* ) and since *Baronius* has not \* *L. 2. c. 7.* prov'd the contrary, nor that the Synod of *Alexandria* knew that he was alive, at the time of its then sitting ; upon whose credit, he says the Pope received *Paulinus*, but by no means upon his Election by *Lucifer*, a Schismatick Bishop, ( though at another time he says *Lucifer* acted therein as the Pope's Legate ) *Meletius's* title will not be ere the worse, but his case will be found to be the same with *Narcissus*, in *Eusebius* † ; upon whose long absence, and † *H.E. l. 6. c. 9.* no communication with them, they supposing him to be dead, the Neighbour Bishops ordain'd three Successors into his See, but after all, received him upon his *postliminium*, or return, in the same capacity, he went out from them : And the present Successor gave way to him, as *Paulinus* and the other *Western* Bishops ought to have done to *Meletius* ; and we have this great circumstance

received his Congregation, which consisted of those Believers  
 \* *Socrat. l. 3.* \* that had adhered to him, and disown'd *Paulinus*, as well as  
 c. 11. *Euzoius*; which latter was the *Arian* Bishop, (who had been in  
*Socr. l. 5, c. 11, 12.* *Antioch* from the time of *Meletius's* absence, and set up, in opposi-  
 tion to them both) tho' *Meletius* was forced to officiate with  
 them in the Suburbs only, when *Paulinus* was permitted to have  
 his Altar in the City, by that favour which was denied *Meletius*  
 by *Euzoius*. And we are hence to observe, which will corroborate  
 what we have just now offer'd in proof of *Eustathius's* resignation,

*First*, That *Meletius* whose Character is so great in the Church  
 for Orthodoxy and Integrity, cannot be thought to have in-  
 sisted on his Orthodoxy alone, upon his possession as a just qua-  
 lification, and competent title to the See of *Antioch*, without  
*Eustathius's* resignation; since he did not allow of *Paulinus's* claim  
 to the same, upon such terms: for *Paulinus* was an *Eustathian*  
 (which sect was entirely Orthodox) and in possession, as *Eus-  
 tathius* had been before him; we have shew'd it to be highly pro-  
 bable, that *Eustathius* resign'd, otherwise the *Eustathians* would  
 not have deserted him, and accepted *Meletius* for their Bishop:  
 which is further prov'd by little less than a demonstration, since  
 none may think, that *Meletius* would have oppos'd *Paulinus* as a  
 possessor without right, when at the same time, himself had  
 been no better than a bare possessor in the See of *Antioch*, with  
 equal injury to *Eustathius*, as he pretended *Paulinus* was to him;  
 unless *Eustathius* had resign'd unto him: if *Paulinus's* title was  
 not good against *Meletius*; *Meletius's* title was not good against  
*Eustathius*, except upon *Eustathius's* resignation, or his voluntary  
 voidance of his right in *Antioch*, by some way which was equiva-  
 lent to it.

2dly. That it is no new thing for a holy and religious Bishop  
 to summon his people, and convene with them, in the worship  
 of God, though it be in some remote and obscure place, when  
 he is overpower'd by Schismatics and Hereticks, and they shut  
 up against him, those Houses of God, that are assign'd in his  
 City, and District, for that purpose, as *Euzoius* the *Arian*, and  
*Paulinus* the Schismatick, did then upon *Meletius*.

3dly. That *Meletius* and his Catholicks, did separate, and keep  
 their worship apart, in respect to *Euzoius* and *Paulinus* alike, and  
 as the Herefie and Schism of the former (for the *Arians* were  
 not only Hereticks but Schismatics) so the Schism alone of the  
 latter, was adjudg'd by him as a just cause, and sufficient war-  
 rant

rant for his doing of it : *St. Cyprian's Second*, or a Bishop that is an illegal *Succeſſor*, and a Bishop that is an Heretical *Succeſſor*, are both to be ſhunn'd : and we ſtand engag'd not to acknowledge, nor to communicate in ſubordination to the one, as much as to the other : the true Catholick *Succeſſion* was then preſerv'd and continued, in oppoſition to both the *Arian* and *Novatian* *Succeſſion* : and will be contradiftinct to Hereſie and Schiſm, to the World's end : tho' it may be leſs pompous and viſible, many times ; and in a corner.

I know, that *Baronius* contends for *Paulinus* as a legitimate Bishop, upon every occaſion in his *Annals* : and for the putting it out of all doubt that he was ſuch, he tells us that *Lucifer Calaritanus* did conſtitute him Bishop of *Antioch*, as the Pope's Legate : but he ſays it in the *Index* of his fourth *Tome*, which refers us to *pag. 176.* where he has not one word of it, nor doth he attempt to prove it any where elſe : neither is he ſingular herein ; it being the uſual precarious way of the *Romiſh* Doctors, to place their Pope in the head, and repreſent him as the *primum Mobile* of every action that ſeems conſiderable : and we will grant the great and excellent *Annaliſt*, that the Bishop of *Rome* did receive *Paulinus* as a Bishop of *Antioch*, as alſo the Council of *Alexandria*, according to the account which *Athanaſius* gives of it, in his *Synodical Epistle ad Antiochenos* ; which Epistle he hath recited at large, and truly in his *Annals* : \* where it alſo appears, that *Athanaſius* \* *An. 362.* and *Eusebius Vercellenſis* did the ſame : the former † exhorts the † *Eph. ad An.* *Antiochians* to unity with *Paulinus*, as their Bishop : but *Sozomen* *tiocbenſes.* || tells us, that *Meletius* was not then return'd from his exile : || *L. 5. c. 11.* ( which is omitted by \* *Socrates* ) and ſince *Baronius* has not \* *L. 2. c. 7.* prov'd the contrary, nor that the Synod of *Alexandria* knew that he was alive, at the time of its then ſitting ; upon whoſe credit, he ſays the Pope received *Paulinus*, but by no means upon his Election by *Lucifer*, a Schiſmatick Bishop, (though at another time he ſays *Lucifer* acted therein as the Pope's Legate) *Meletius's* title will not be ere the worſe, but his caſe will be found to be the ſame with *Narciffus*, in *Eusebius* † ; upon whoſe long abſence, and † *H.E. l. 6. c. 9.* no communication with them, they ſuppoſing him to be dead, the Neighbour Bishops ordain'd three *Succeſſors* into his See, but after all, received him upon his *poſtliminium*, or return, in the ſame capacity, he went out from them : And the preſent *Succeſſor* gave way to him, as *Paulinus* and the other *Western* Bishops ought to have done to *Meletius* ; and we have this great circumſtance

to perswade us to think, that the Bishops of the Synod of *Alexandria* and they of the *West*, might easily think, that *Meletius* was not then alive, to challenge his right; since he did not return upon *Julian's* Edict, which (we know) gave him, and all the exil'd Bishops, liberty to do it, and to come home; but continued in his banishment and obscurity, till the days \* of *Valens*. And this will be the more confirm'd, since St. *Basil* is express in his *Epistle ad Terentium*, cited by † *Baronius*, that the *Western* Bishops were, many of them, ignorant of the affairs of the *East*, when they rejected *Meletius*, and communicated under *Paulinus*; and those that knew them better, related them contentiously, and not according to the truth: and it may not be unlikely, but that *Eusebius Samosatenfis* was dissatisfied upon *Paulinus's* election, for the same reason, and refused † to communicate with him: if it be demanded, how *Meletius's* People at *Antioch*, which constantly adhered to, and communicated with him, during his absence, knew that he was alive, any more than the *Western* Bishops did? I answer, that as we have no reason to suspect it, so we have just reason to believe that they had a constant information of his being alive, by Letters or some other way: especially, since we have just grounds, from St. *Chrysostome*, to believe, that they had correspondence from *Thrace*, whether *Meletius* was exil'd: and, indeed if they had not done it, they could not have acquitted themselves of Schism, in making such their distinct worship; *Paulinus* being otherwise unexceptionable, save only that he possessed a See, to which another Bishop had a just right, being then alive, only in banishment by the secular Arm. But Doctor *Hody* does not seem to have consider'd any of these things; nor to be concern'd which way they go: believing himself abundantly secur'd, that it makes nothing against *Paulinus's* title, as a *Possessor*, though *Meletius* was alive together with him, and not rightfully remov'd, upon Church Terms; and his Party did not receive *Paulinus*, but waited for *Meletius's* return, and adher'd to him in his absence: nor that any thing like an argument is thereby administred on our side; since they refused *Paulinus* for other reasons, which he has produced, and I have a little above recited: \* and shall here give in my answer to each of them. And,

1. The first reason (which he is inclinable to conceal,) viz. That *Paulinus* was esteem'd by some not *Orthodox*, ought not indeed to have been nam'd by him: it being the usual practice of the *Arians*, to represent the *Homousians* as *Sabellians*, to make them

\* *Baron.* an. 852.

p. 88.

† *An.* 3. 72.

9. 327.

† *Soz.* l. 5. c. 12.

*Socrat.* l. 2. c. 7.

† *Sect.* 3.

thereby less acceptable, even odious to their own People; even others that did less incline to Arianism, were very apt to apprehend the Catholicks to be really such: in that they asserted the Father and the Son to be of *one substance*: because they could not find out any distinction between the three Persons in the Trinity (which the *Sabellians* deny'd) unless they were allow'd to be three distinct Substances; which the Catholick Doctrine of *one substance* altogether precluded.

2. It had been more for the Doctors credit, if he had also passed over, without naming it, that other reason which he has given, why the *Meletians* might oppose *Paulinus*, and refuse to communicate under him upon it, and not upon his unjust possession, *viz.* *Because he did not allow of the Meletian Clergy as being deriv'd from the Arians.* For this could not, in all likelihood, be their plea, since *Paulinus* was one of the *Alexandrian* Synod, which determin'd, that those who had so far comply'd, with the *Arians*, as to receive orders from them, should be receiv'd, upon their repentance, with their orders, and remain Priests in their former stations; of which we have the account in \* *Athanasius*: and they did no otherwise therein than the Church of God had always done before them: even the first Council of *Nicea* †; and the more ancient famous Council || of *Antioch*, which received *Paulus Samosatenus* in his Bishoprick, upon his repentance: besides, *Paulinus* was never accounted a *Luciferian*; whole error we know, consisted in the denying communion with those Bishops, who had *Arian* hands laid upon them; though they did afterwards come over to the Church, and relinquish the Heresie: but, if the Objector will persist, that *Meletius* did withstand *Paulinus* as a *Luciferian*; since *Lucifer* was not condemn'd as an Heretick, but only as a Schismatick, in that he refused to communicate with his Brethren, the Bishops; and refus'd it upon those terms which the Church did not allow: we shall hereby gain that which *Dr. Hody* will not thank us for: and with as much authority on our side, as the practice of so great a man, as *Meletius* is known to have been, can add to it, *viz.* *That a depriv'd Bishop hath not submitted to his Successor, though he was no Heretick, Paulinus being in all other things such whose communion no good Catholicks can justly refuse.* *Catholicum quidem & sanctum virum, & per omnia dignum sacerdotio Paulinum Episcopum collocavit,* as *Ruffinus* \* speaks of him: have we not as much authority on our side, as the Church of God can give us? Which

\* *Ep. Synod ad Antio censes.*  
† *Can. 8.*  
|| *Eccl. H. E. l. 7. c. 24.*

\* *H. Socrat. l. 2. c. 27.*

refused



refused to communicate with *Lucifer Calaritanus* solely upon the same account: and the main point is clear'd. For it is manifest, that if *Meletius*, the ejected Bishop, did not refuse *Paulinus* the Successor, as an intruder on his Church Right, and in that instance of the sin, a Schismatick: he had sufficient ground to do it, as he was a Schismatick in the foremention'd instance of it: and *Paulinus's* Orthodoxy would have vindicated him against *Meletius*, no otherwise than *Lucifer's* Orthodoxy did him, against the Church of God.

I have already observed, how *Baronius* all along, contends to have *Paulinus* the Catholick Bishop of *Antioch*, though he owns *Meletius* to have been alive at the same time: and I cannot but further take notice with what impotency and meanness of argument he pursues it: as, when he gives this for one of his reasons, viz. because *Meletius* was once an *Arian*, and had been consecrated by the *Arian* Bishops: but did not the Church, at that time, receive all such in their Orders? Does not the *Annalist* tell us so? But the learn'd Cardinal had recorded it as true History, that *Lucifer Calaritanus* did enthrone *Paulinus* in the *Antiochian* Chair, as the Pope's Legate; and he is bound to make the performance as passable as he can; though his attempts do make but the whole more incredible, as it is usual for those to do, that embarque in a bad cause: And, notwithstanding a most establish'd principle in the Church is violated by it, and two Bishops are in one Chair at the same time, he is abundantly secur'd, that his *Holiness's* appearance in the Cause, is a competent dispensation for it all. And I think it will be the Doctors best way to take up his refuge there also, and vouch his Successor (at least at *Antioch*) by the same authority: I am sure he may do it by as good argument as he uses, when he proves, in the next place, that the *Meletians* did not refuse communion with *Paulinus* on the score of his being an Usurper, and unjustly possessed of *Meletius's* Chair; because they refused him, as plac'd in the *Antiochian* Chair, by him who had no authority for it; and for this he tells us

3ly. That *Paulinus* was placed in his See by an incompetent Authority: For, *Lucifer Calaritanus* (who seated him there) had nothing at all to do with the See of *Antioch*: What authority had he to constitute a Bishop of *Antioch*? Had *Meletius* been dead, the Church of *Antioch* would not have been oblig'd to submit to *Paulinus*, whom he made Bishop. And what then? might they not refuse him

An. 362. p. 87.

Ibid.

P. 192.

him, as *St. Cyprian's Second*, and a Possessor without right, because *Meletius* was a live; and likewise, because we was placed there by *Lucifer's* hands, which were not sufficiently authoriz'd for it? How do these two reasons exclude one another? The Doctor may see how they do, but no body else can, if *Meletius* had been dead, they could not be said to refuse *Paulinus* for both reasons, but only for the latter: But so long as he was alive they might have refused him for both reasons, for what any man alive can discern, but himself, in the two reasons, as rendering their doing of it, upon the account of them, inconsistent: And why he urges *Lucifer's* supposed powerless enthroning him, as an Argument that they did not receive him, because he was an intruder upon *Meletius*, he seems only able to give an account. Besides; does not the Doctor wonderfully forget his main *Prolegomenon*: viz. *That Possession and Orthodoxy create a right, and oblige the Subjects to receive the present Bishop under these two qualifications, though the predecessor be unjustly remov'd, and consequently the Possessor was unduly enthron'd?* I always thought that the Principle which they have advanced, had obliged them to receive him that is in the Chair, i. e. the *Possessor*, if other ways unexceptionable: And how comes it then to pass that the Doctor pleads, that the *Meletians* might refuse *Paulinus* when possessed by *Lucifer*, and was every waies else unexceptionable, save that he had not a Right to do it? He thinks fit (in \* one place of his Book) to put us upon this Impossibility, (as he concludes it to be) *That to justify our selves from the charge of Schisme, in that we do not submit to the present unjust and uncanonical Deprivations, and receive the present Possessors, we ought to prove that no one Bishop, who is put into the place of another, deposed by an incompetent Authority, ought to be own'd: whereas even himself has put us in a ready way to do it; he hath done it to our hands; in that he hath granted, from the Meletians practice, and his own principles, that Paulinus was not own'd, because he was placed in Antioch by an incompetent Authority: And that we in England are not oblig'd to receive an Archbishop of Canterbury, constituted by an Outlandish Bishop, that had nothing at all to do here, in the room of a Banish'd Archbishop: For, surely the Incompetency of an Authority can no more legitimate the Displacing, than the placing of a Bishop.*

But to speak a word or two as to the Incompetency of a Bishop to act, and constitute a Bishop out of his own district, under

\*To the Reader.

under the same Emergences *Lucifer* of *Sardinia* acted, when he placed *Paulinus* in *Antioch* : Now if it be so as the Doctor will have it, and *Lucifer* had no right, as a Bishop of Christendom, ( though *Meletius* had been dead or alive, and justly abdicated ) to come into *Antioch*, and consecrate and fix an Orthodox Bishop there, and oblige the *Antiochians* to receive him, for the continuance or replantation of the Catholick Doctrine and Succession, which by reason of the Heresy and Schism of the *Arians*, was in visible danger to be suppressed, if not quite extinguished, they having then possessed themselves of all the Churches in that City : For, saving that *Paulinus* ( sometime after his Enthronement ) gain'd a Church of *Euzois* the *Arian* Bishop, within the Walls, out of a respect to his person, not his Doctrine, the *Homosians* held their Assembly, for Gods worship, in the suburbs only : I say, if this be a fixed truth, as the Doctor peremptorily asserts it to be ; and *Lucifer Calaritanus* had then no right in *Antioch*, nor any Forrein Bishop has at this day, in *England*, or any Region, which is not his proper district, to retrieve and restore the Christian Doctrine and Succession, under the forementioned, or the like emergencies : I do demand of him, what account he will give of the Practice of the most eminent Bishops of Christendom ( especially during the *Eusebian* and *Arian* Persecutions, and prosperous success of Schism and Heresy at that time ) who have all along done the same that *Lucifer* did in *Antioch* and Taught and Ordain'd in the respective Regions, in which they were exil'd, Arianism having infected the whole World ? And also of such Orthodox Prelates, and Subjects, who either justified, or obey'd them in it ? Or how will he reconcile this ( if he thinks there be need ) to his principles ?

\* *Socr. l. 2. c. 19.*

I'll begin first with the great and most holy *Athanasius*, who, being recalled from his Exile by *Constantius*, in his way to *Alexandria*, Taught the Believers that they should avoyd the *Arians*, and adhere to the *Homosian* Doctrine : And he ordain'd in many of the Churches : And tho' the *Eusebians* added his doing of it to the number of his accusations ; and it was one of their charges against him ; we do not find it was reputed his crime by the Catholicks : † *Eusebius Vercellensis* travell'd over the East, and reduc'd and settled the Churches there : and *Hilarius Pictavensis* did the same in *France*, and in *Italy* : neither did *Eusebius Damascianensis* come behind any of them in the same Duty : But being

Εὐχριστὸν ἐκ-  
κλησίαν ἢ χει-  
ροτονίας ἐπέσει  
ἐν ταῖς ἄλλαις  
παροικίαις.

† *Socr. l. 5. c. 12.*

being banish'd by *Valens*, and knowing that many Churches were deprived of their Pastors, he travelled over *Syria*, *Phœnicia*, † *Theod. H. E. l. 4. c. 12.* and *Palestine* in a disguised habit, and there created Presbyters and Deacons, and performed other Ecclesiastical Offices: And

if at any time he met with Bishops who consented with him in Doctrine, he constituted them Governors over such Churches as wanted Pastors. Though *Eustatbius* did resign his Bishoprick of *Antioch* to *Meletius*, and

quitted himself of his special care of that City, he did not also quit his Episcopal power, and lay aside his Function: But when he was freed from his Exile by *Jovianus*, he came to *Constantinople*, that he might confirm the *Homousian* Faith in that City: as we read in St. \* *Chrysostome* † *Socrates* and *Sozomen*. \* *Hom. de Eust. Antioch. Tom. 5. Ed. lat. Paris. † l. 4. c. 13. p. l. 6. c. 13.*

St. *Chrysostome* says, ' That he then govern'd their City of *Constantinople*, and as a wise Physitian prepared all manner of Medicines for the prevention of that disease, which he foresaw would, through *Arianism*, in a little time, infest them, as it had done all their neighbours, having an active and general care of all, inciting all men of all orders, that they should watch and attend as if the Pyrats had actually fir'd their City, and shiprack'd their Faith. But *Socrates* and *Sozomen* are more particular who tell us, ' That the people chose *Evagrius* their Bishop, upon the death of *Eudoxius* the *Arian*, who had intruded into the *Constantinopolitan* Chair, and that *Eustatbius* consecrated and enthron'd him: For which *Valens* banish'd them both. But they were not suspended or censured for it, by their brethren the Catholick Bishops: And the true Succession in that City was asserted and maintain'd by it, and the Gospel glorified in their sufferings upon it. -- *Ibid. supra.*

St. *Chrysostome* goes on, and tells us; ' That *Eustatbius* did not only take care of their particular City, but sent forth his Emisseries into all parts, that should teach, exhort, dispute, and preclude the enemy in each of his approaches it being the duty of a Bishop to be solicitous, not only for that one Church, which the Holy Ghost hath committed to him, but for every Church in the Christian World: accordingly as it is his duty to pray for the whole Church.

de quavis in orbe terrarum constituta—si enim pro Universa Ecclesia magis ejus Universa gerere curam oportet.

Neque vero hic tantum hanc curam adhibuit, sed in omnes partes mittebat, qui docerent, qui hortarentur, qui disputarent, qui hostibus aditum omnem intercluderent -- Ecclesia presulem non de illa tantum sollicitum esse debere, quæ a Spiritu Sancto illi commissæ est, sed etiam fundenda sunt preces multæ

To come home, to our own Kingdome; epecially sin Doctor *Hody* has made one of his Instances here : No man will say, but that *Austin* the Monk was rightfully constituted Archbishop of *Canterbury* by *Gregory* the great, who was an outlandish Bishop, i. e. Bishop of *Rome* : we to be sure may not say otherwise, since we claim the Succession of our Bishops from him; And because the Succession had fail'd, and Christianity with it, by reason of the banishment, and other hard usage, the Bishops had receiv'd upon the return of Heathenism, which then mostly reign'd in this *Island* : The returning of the Christian Religion was sufficient to warrant it. And there is not any thing in that performance which makes these two great Men to appear blame worthy, but that *Gregory* claim'd a right to it, as his own peculiar, exclusive to the rest of the Bishops of Christendom, And pleaded a power from the same bottom, as derived from *Christ* and *St. Peter* to him, enabling him to inspect and animadvert upon all of them, and to be unaccountable for it; even to demand a subjection from them : And *Austin*, in pursuance of his Commission from him, extended it to *Wales* : And exercised it Autoratively and Arbitrarily over the Pastors, and Believers, and their Archbishop there, who were duly and regularly seated in a just polity, rightful government and subordination, the sincere profession of the Orthodox Faith, and in a lawful Succession. The sum of the whole matter is this.

No Bishop, by the Canons of the Church, may act out of his district, except in Barbarous Regions, in which there is no Bishop : Or when another, district is over run with Heresy and Schism, to the hazarding of the Catholick Faith and Succession; under which emergencies he may, and ought upon a possibility of success, to extend his care, and exercise his Episcopal Function, without his pale; even by constituting his own Officers there; as the forementioned eminent Bishops and Confessors have done : And, not only their practice, but the polity of Christendom will bear him out in it : A Reformation is otherwise impracticable, upon an Apostasy of one or more Churches; if the State of the World be such, that Synods cannot be had : Unless we shou'd follow *Baronius*, and call in the Popes universal Pastorship and Superintendency for that purpose : And therefore that \* Annalist says, that *Athanasius*, *Eusebius Vercellensis*, and *Lucifer Calaritanus* acted in their Rein.



rein inspections, as Legates from *Rome*; but precariously enough, and without any bottom for it. And perhaps as our Church of *England* was reformed by some of her own Doctors and Bishops, who Consecrated other Bishops, and fixed them in Sees, which were then filled with *Romanists*, as the forementioned Sees, in which the abovenamed eminent Servants of God placed their Bishops, were fill'd with *Arians*, so our Church will be found able to justify herself; but upon the same Considerations, and upon them only; at least not without them. And I heartily wish some of those who have undertook her Justification, had consider'd those famous Presidents a little more than they have done: but of this only by the way. It is manifest that these things did not come into Doctor *Hody's* thoughts: If they had, he would not, surely, have urged it as unlawful in all cases, for a forrein Bishop to act beyond his District: and we can allow him to defend a Successor possessing a full See, upon the foremention'd Considerations. But in the fourth and last place.

4bly. He out does his unthinking self, when he urges, that Meletius's Party did not receive Paulinus, but adher'd to Meletius, because no Sovereign power had at that time made Meletius *un- capable of serving as Bishop of Antioch*; the Emperor having recall'd his banishment, and given him leave to return to his See, and he was upon the road. For, besides the *ἑὸν Πῦδος* which it imply's: As, that the Imperial Prescription doth unmake, and it's relaxation make, a Bishop, and engage or disengage a People, as to their dependance upon him: He that had thought at all, would never have intimated, that such considerations could have any ways influenced these *Meletians*, to the rejecting, or receiving, their proper Bishop *Meletius*: For what is more manifest then the zeal with which they accompanied him, (so long as they could) and adher'd to him, upon his banishment? It's heat and fervency boyl'd too high: And they assaulted the Governor, that carried him away, with stones: Neither did they, with less love, and zeal, and conscience of duty, but better regulated, follow him into *Armenia*, though they were, in their persons, disjoyned from him; but own'd him alone to be their supreme Pastor, Communicating under him, and no other, as their Virtual Head, in their separate conventions at *Antioch*, until his return unto them, whom they then received with all expressions of obedience, joy, and gratitude, as the Pa-

\* Hom. de Afel.  
Antioch.

stor and Bishop of their Souls; and, under *Christ Jesus*, the great Instrument of their Salvation: All which and more may be seen in St. \* *Chrysostome*: And I have in part, given an account of it. Surely, there is nothing in all this that can give a man of common perceptions occasion to believe, that the Secular banishment did cut off their Subordination, and quit them of their allegiance to him: The contrary is evident beyond a Contradiction. And is it not again as evident to the same common apprehensions, that as he remain'd a Bishop, in the full extent of his right, notwithstanding his exile, and it did not in the least intercept it, but his People own'd and obey'd him, as their Bishop, during the whole time of his absence, so, that such his right is no ways owing to his return by the favour of the Empire: And that his People cannot be conceived to have thought it was? *Meletius's* being upon the road homewards could not create that right in him, which he had in *Armenia*, nor be the reason why *Paulinus* was rejected, and himself received by his *Antiochians*: Nothing but the Doctors Ignorance of the Story, and matter of Fact, or his rash and undigested thoughts, could occasion him to produce this as an instance, upon such an occasion.

#### S E C T. IV.

**H**AVING touch'd upon the undue behaviour of *Meletius's* Party towards the Governor of the City, upon his taking their Bishop from them into *Armenia*: I shall venture upon a digression, so far as to give an account of the whole Passage, and to make some just Observations vpon it: The doing of which will tend much to the Reputation of his Flock, and mostly of *Meletius* himself, since it will thence plainly appear, that it was not for the honour and riches of his Bishoprick, that he contended with *Paulinus* and his *Eustathians* (for part of the *Eustathians* adhered to *Paulinus*, and part to *Meletius* upon the Schism) but the Institutions and the rights of the of the Church, and its Unity and Peace, which would have suffer'd much, by his submission to a Successor against the Laws of it. Though I expect no thanks from the Doctor for it, If these Papers should chance to come into his hands. The whole matter of Fact is this, as it may be found in St. *Chrysostome*, in the abovemention'd Homily. When the Governor of the City

City rode in his Chariot over the middle of the market Place, and caused the Holy Bishop to be placed by him, Stones thicker than snow were cast at his head from every side, the City by no means bearing his being taken away; but chose rather to die, then lose him. But what did the blessed Bishop do? Seeing the cast of stones, he folded up his Garments, and cover'd the Presidents head with them, and made his enemies ashamed by that his eminent Instance of his own meekness: and taught them and his people at once what patience they ought to shew towards them that do them injury: and that they ought, not only to do them no hurt, but even when they are in danger from other men, to rescue them from it, with their best endeavour.

I will add to this a no less eminent Instance of the like behaviour, in all meekness, humanity, and charity, which the Apostolical Eusebius, Bishop of Samosata, hath left to the World, by his own practice, and at the same time: of which Theodorit gives us this following account in his Church History. When the Emperours Edict for his Banishment was deliver'd unto him, he receiv'd it with the greatest Christian Prudence and magnanimity: And first order'd the messenger to keep it private, lest the People should rise upon it, and cast him into Euphrates, which runs by the City Walls, and his life should be required at the Bishops hands by the Government: And then (it being twilight when the message was brought) having said evening Prayer, as he usually did, instead of going to sleep, he went out of the City, attended with one Servant, who carried a Pillow and a Book, and coming to the River, he took shipping, and safely arrived, so soon as it was day, at Zeugma, as he designed. Samosata was by this time fill'd with sorrow and complaints, upon the loss of their Bishop, being inform'd of his departure by another Servant, who was to follow him with a few necessary things: And the Citizens went directly to Euphrates, and after they had sailed up and down, for sometime, they at length came to him: whom they solicited, with lamentations and groans, and the force of tears, to return to them, and not leave them to the cruelty of Wolves: But when they could not persuade him, and had heard him recite the Precept of St. Paul, in Which we are manifestly commanded to obey Magistrates and Powers; he receiv'd a few of those many things they presented him with, to sustain him in his long Journey. and when he had fortified them with his Weapons of Doctrine and Prayers, and exceedingly exhorted them, that they would defend the Apostolical precepts, he departed from them.

Those Bishops that are truly Apostolical, and under persecution

\* L. 4. c. 13.  
 ΟΥΔΕΝΩΝ ΉΛΠΙΣΤΕΝ  
 ΣΠΙΛΑΝ ΤΗ ΣΟΦΙΑΝ  
 ΕΠΕΔΕΙΞΑΤΟ ΒΑΣΙΛΕΥΣ  
 ΚΑΙΝ ΔΙΣΤΑΜΕΝΟΝ  
 ΑΙΤΟΥ.

Ο ΔΙΑΠΟΡΙΣΤΑΣ  
 ΣΑΡΔΕΣ ΔΕΧΑΙΕ  
 ΚΑΙ ΕΞΕΙΣΙΑΣ  
 ΔΙΑΤΑΚΕΙΝΑΙ.

cution, do not then preach *Mob* Doctrines to their people? They are so far from inciting the Believers to make insurrection for their rescue; that they will not countenance them, when they are made: But their business is to suppress them, and reprove those that are actors, and managers of them, lest they receive damnation for it: They not only teach their Flocks *passive Obedience*, and *non-resistance* to the Powers on earth, under their harder Sentences; but to be active and serviceable in the preservation and defence of their Persons, though in execution of them: and take care that their unjust Laws and Edicts be receiv'd with the same calm and resignation as those that are most righteous; and that no striving be in the Streets by reason of them, any more then there was in *Jerusalem*, when our Saviour was led forth to be crucified. The best of Princes have not only mutable natures and wills, as well as other men; but they are more subject to change upon the account of the singular circumstances they are always under: and the Church of God has still suffer'd more or less by reason of them: The great *Eustathius* of *Antioch*, to whom the Christian Church ow'd so much, was banish'd by *Constantine* the Great, through the *Eusebians* instigation, who had influenced him too much towards his latter end: St. \* *Cyril* and *Memnon*, two eminent Bishops, and Defenders of the Faith, suffer'd for a time in the Council of *Ephesus*, and the Catholick Faith of one person in the Incarnation, as before of *one Substance* together with them, under *Theodosius* the younger; though he was no Heretick, but a stout Defender of the Christian Doctrine, and Liberty, by his Principles: and the Persons and Doctrines of these two Catholick Bishops were Anathematized at once by a Convention held in an Inn, under *John* of *Antioch*, and *Nestorius* and his Heresy were receiv'd as Orthodox: But the good Emperor was cheated into it by the treachery and false Information of *Candidianus*, a principal Favorite, and the *Nestorians* party at Court; whose craft and industry was such, that they precluded all Posts, which the true Council sent to inform his Majesty of the truth of its proceedings, and their own integrity. Even *Constantius* was no ill man in himself, nor perhaps in his principles: But he was carried away by a powerful Party of the Clergy and Laity; and it was through their deceit and instigation that he so sorely persecuted the Orthodox. Now, under all these infelicities and more of them, the truly Apostolical

\* *Socr.* l. 7. c. 33.

*Evag.* l. 1. c. 3.

4, 5. 12.

stolical Bishops made it their business (as I have above shew'd, to form their Flocks into the Christian temper of meekness, modesty and gentleness, and an entire submission and resignation to that part of it which was worldly, bodily, and penal; without any abatement of their duty and love to those, which laid the burden upon them: and they claim'd right and truth, when retrenched, with the same complexion: but never by bringing in, or abetting a foreign Power, with force and arms, to retrieve and restore them: as the \* *Romanists* once did *Rodolphus* upon the Emperor *Hen. IV.* (he having as they said, at least, usurped some Church Privileges) whom they first placed on *Henry's* Throne, and after him his two Sons, by an horrid and most unnatural Rebellion, on *Hildebrandian* Principles, though *Rodolphus* being mortally wounded, was brought to repentance: (of which vertue I do not find *Henry's* two Sons to have been guilty) and when he was on his death-bed, call'd for his right-hand, which had been cut off in a Battle, and shew'd it to the Bishops which stood by, and had incited him to that hideous Rebellion, speaking these words to them: † *This is the right-hand with which I confirm'd the Faith which I promised to the Emperor: this is a sign of the Faith which I violated by your instigation, and is a witness of your perfidiousness, of which an account is to be given to God by you.*

\* *Vid. Carion. Chron. lib. 4. in Hen. 4.*

† *Hæc dextra est inquit, qua Imperatori promissam fidem confirmavi, hæc violata à me, vobis impulsoribus, fidei argumentum: ty nefaria vestre perfidia testis est: de qua à vobis rationes reddenda erunt Deo.*

In short, when the secular arm remov'd their Bishops, they were instructed by no means to submit to, and receive the Successor: but to continue their subordination to the abdicated, and to hold communion with them, in their separate Conventions, and the Apostolical Doctrine and Discipline, in a rightful Succession, and to preclude Schism as well as Heresie: but in other respects to give way to the outward force in meekness of spirit, as a notorious and indispensable duty laid upon them by *St. Paul*: and this was the practice of *Meletius's* party in *Antioch*, in opposition, not only to *Euzoius* the *Arian* Possessor, and his Heterodoxies in Faith, but to *Paulinus* and his *Eustathians*, (for, as I have already said, though the *Eustathians* were they who first followed *Eustathius*, upon his removal from *Antioch*; they afterwards divided, and some adhered to *Meletius*, and some to *Paulinus*) which *Eustathians* were Orthodox in Doctrine, but maintained a possession upon a full See: and accordingly, *Eusebius Samosatensis's* People are said, (in *|| Theodorit's* History of that Affair). rich and poor, master and ser-

|| *L. 4. C. 19.*

uant,



\* ἀλλ' ὁμοῦ καὶ  
 ποιμένοι καὶ  
 μαθηταὶ τὰ  
 ποιοῦντων ἐπὶ  
 γὰρ οὕτω.

vant, man and woman, young and old, to have forsaken the Church upon a Successor ascending his Throne at *Samosata*: and when they were depriv'd of their Pastor, they executed his office,\* in their several stations and capacities; whether as Presbyters, Deacons, or believers only: the latter, as such, having a right, and it is their duty, when no Officers can be had, to pray to God and praise him, and exhort one another while it is to day, in their respective stations: and they thus continuing in Faith and good Works, became, though rejected of men, mighty with God; and so prevailed, that in his own good time, their eyes saw again their Teachers: and he restored their Bishops unto them, though by the hands of *Julian* the Apostate, and his toleration; which he design'd for the Church's extirpation; and his mercy will still find out a way that our Bishops shall not always, nor finally, be banish'd from us. And we may securely expect it by virtue of the same promise, which our Saviour made to his Church, that he would be with her *always to the end of the World*. And tho' the adversaries of *Judah* do prevail upon the death of *Cyrus*, and obtain an *Artaxerxes* to be his Successor, so that the building does not go on for a time, as it was when the second Temple was erecting; he will afterwards send us a *Darius*, who shall take care that it may be continued: and by these Vicissitudes, as the *Jews* did of old, who, in their passage to their *Canaan*, were sometimes in Vallies, and sometimes on the Hills, sometimes in smooth, and sometimes in rough Places; sometimes in Peace, and sometimes in War, shall we also possess our *Canaan* till the end of this Government, shall be, by a restitution of all things: then, when *Christ* shall deliver up the Kingdom to the Father, that God may be all in all.

## S E C T. V.

I Will make the following remarks upon *Meletius*, *Paulinus*, *Flavianus* and *Evagrius*, all either rightful or pretended Bishops of *Antioch*; which may be useful in our present controversy; and then shake hands with them: And in the first place I do observe.

I. That after a long Dissention, and Schism, which had distracted the Church of *Antioch*, † *Paulinus*, and *Meletius*, upon an accommodation between themselves, were jointly and unanimously receiv'd by the whole Church, (especially the Pastors and Peo-

ple in that City, that were Orthodox) to be Bishops there, during the natural life of each of them: and, upon the death of either, the Superviver was to be Bishop alone. \* *Theodoret* says, *L. 1. C. 3.* that the Divine *Meletius*, being desirous that there should be no difference about the primacy, made this offer, *viz.* that they might govern in common, and feed the Flocks as one man; but *Paulinus* did not accept it, and it was referr'd to *Sapor*, who was † *Cap. 3. ibid.* appointed by the Emperor *Gratian* to take care that the Law, which his Majesty had made for restoring the Bishops, whom *Valens* ejected, should be duly executed, and *Sapor* adjusted their jurisdictions apart. I shall stay here a little, and observe, the thing it self is very plain, *viz.* That the separation which we find to have been in the Church of *Antioch* and Anti-communication, was not made by the respective parties, upon the account of Heresie in either of the Bishops; since there is nothing more certain, than that *Meletius* and *Paulinus* were Orthodox at that time: for if they had not, but Heresie had been the bar to their union, care would have been taken, upon the accommodation, for the removing of it; otherwise the Schism must have remain'd as before, because the Heresie, the occasion of it, would have remain'd; if *Paulinus* had not taken up that error which *Lucifer Calaritanus* afterwards improv'd into a rupture in the Church, and believ'd that *Meletius* ought not to be own'd as a true Bishop, nor communicated with, because he was ordain'd by the *Arian* Bishops: it is well known that *Lucifer* was never censur'd as an Heretick for it, but only as a Schismatick. Since then both were Orthodox, the Schism must have remain'd, or never have been, or some other ground, besides their Heresy, is to be assign'd for it. And if Orthodoxy alone, as such, would have legitimated a Communion with them, they would have been as lawfull Bishops before the stipulation, as after it. And yet Doctor *Hody* very frequently insists, and with a great deal of assurance, (as I have before observ'd) that those many Catholicks, whom he owns to have rejected such Bishops as possessed Sees in injury to others then alive, and who were their rightful Bishops, might, and would have receiv'd them, if they had been Orthodox, *i. e.* they had not been *Arians*: for if so, what made this disturbance in *Antioch*? Or, what ground was there for a Church debate about it? Or, what pleas had the Orthodox there for their not communicating before, as afterwards, but the supposed unjust, and therefore Schismatical possessions of the opposite

Bishops? Or, how were things alter'd, upon the common agreement, and Church determination? Or, how will the Doctor go about to make any one believe, ( who is not resolv'd beforehand to be of his Party ) that since the *Arians*, upon their Ordinations into full Sees, erected and continued a Succession against the Catholick Succession, in the same notorious and visible manner as the *Novatians* and *Donatists* did; those *Arians* were not also to be rejected for their Schism in so doing, though they had no Heresy, as he must own the Catholick Church had all along refused to own and Communicate with these *Donatists* and *Novatians*, purely and solely upon the account of their Schism? Neither is any thing more sure, than that this Anti-communion in *Antioch*, was also founded upon the same bottom of Schism on the one or the other side, in the apprehension, at least, of the two respective Bishops, and their people: And *Paulinus* either pleaded his Possession, to which *Meletius* could not submit, because, though he was absent at the time of *Paulinus*'s enthroning, he was alive, and had not resign'd, and was then present and demanded his Right. Or else *Paulinus* might plead that *Meletius* was Ordain'd by *Arian* Bishops: But none of these pleas could amount to any more than Schism: for, in all other respects, the Competitors were unsuspected, and believed to be as entire and untainted, as in their faith.

2. We have here an Instance of the Churches Right and Practice in disposing of Bishopricks, and making them more or fewer, as her prudence shall see occasion, for the better service of the Faith: And the same City of *Antioch*, which had but one Bishop ever since the Believers were first call'd *Christians* there upon St. *Peters* preaching to them in the Acts of the Apostles, hath now two Bishops lawfully, and truly, constituted, ( besides the false ones of the \* *Arian* and *Apollinarian* Sects, which she then also had ) to continue so long as *Paulinus* and *Meletius* live: And when one dies, or other ways lawfully quits his Charge, the remainder is to be Bishop alone, and their districts, before a part, are then to be blended again, and united, and the single Succession to continue, unless the Churches wisdom, upon some emergency, sees fit to make a further alteration.

† *Baronius* says, that this settlement was made by a Council: But he produces no Authority for it: and I am so much the more inclinable to think he had none, because ‖ *Natalis Alexander* mentions

none

\* Theod. H. E.  
l. 5. c. 3.

† An 378. p. 393.  
‖ H. E. Secul. 3.  
4. Part. 1.

none in this account of the Synods of that Age, but that the Clergy made it out of Council, seeing their stations out of it qualified them for that performance: Neither hath a Council been alwaies thought necessary for it; and much less the Secular Arm: For, the piety of *Gratian*, upon his coming to the Empire, did \* fix those Bishops in their Sees, whom *Valens* \* *Soc. l. 7. c. 7.* had banished, and *Meletius* among the rest, had the benefit of *Theod. l. 5. c. 2.* his Edict: But it was only a fixing them in their own Sees, to which they had a Church Right before; and *Gratian* confirm'd indeed but, otherwise did not meddle with the Districts nor the Bishops, which the Church authority had assign'd. And though *Baronius* is very angry with *Theodorit* (the other Historians say nothing of it) for representing *Sapor*, the Emperor's Prefect, to have appointed *Paulinus* and *Meletius* their distinct Jurisdictions; I cannot see what reason *Baronius* had for it, as if the Prefect had invaded the Churches right. For, the Church had before, by consent of all Parties, settled the Government of the City in them both: And his Arbitration, which assign'd each of them a District apart, is so far from implying an original antecedent Right in the Civil Power, derived unto *Sapor*, at that time, from the Empire, for that one end, that it is thence very plain, he acted only by that power which the Church gave him, when she made him Arbitrator: And his Decision had no other effect than that which she promised to receive, and stand by: Though it hath happen'd that the Empire has divided a District, upon its own Motion, for its own reasons: It is well known that the Emperor \* *Justinian* \* *Præfat. ad* took *Justinianæa Prima* out of the Diocels of *Thessalonica*, *Novel. 11. c.* because it was the City of his birth: And it is reckon'd among *Novel. 130.* the Churches that are *Autocefalous*, by † *Balsamon*: But he is not *cap. 4.* to be conceiv'd to have done this without the Churches consent: † *In can. 2. cona. gen. Constantino.* Especially not without the allowance of the Primate of *Thessalonica*, whose previous concurrence, and not the Emperors authority, a one, legitimated the district, and its Bishop: Neither could the Bishops of Christendom have communicated with him, upon other terms.

It may be here objected, that this settlement of two Bishops in one City, with distinct Jurisdictions in it, at the same time, is not agreeable with a very ancient, and universally receiv'd, Canon of the Church, which hath order'd, that there should be no more than one Bishop, at one time, in a City: But

Can. 12. Apost.  
Can. 8. Conc. 1.  
Nic. & abili  
fapius.

this will readily appear to be a mistake: For that Canon was so phrased in compliance with the general custom of the Church in those days, according to which, every City had a Bishop; in so much, that a City and a District were *Synonymous*; and the only meaning and importance of it, is, that one Bishop shall not interfere upon another, much more intrude, but keep his own station and bounds which are set, and limited him upon Church Terms, whether they contain more or less, and consist of half a City, or a whole one, or of more Cities than one. Neither can it, with any congruity of reason, be apprehended, that such a tract of ground, with such boundaries, inhabited by such a people, and vested with such privileges, must necessarily make one Diocese and no more; and have but one Bishop in it, upon what emergencies soever: Especially, since no one pleads our Saviour's Institution for the limitation of it. Surely, as *Paulinus* and *Meletius* were constituted Bishops of *Antioch*, and resided and exercised Jurisdiction there at the same time, the same Authority might have taken in the *Arian* and *Apollinarian* Bishops, who had, at the same time, seated themselves there, and made the two Bishops four, if the latter would have laid aside their Heresy, and come in upon Church terms; and if the doing of it had been found truly serviceable to the Church of God: Hence two Bishops have been in one and the same City in good times: Of which abundance of Instances may be given; and none of them were thought to violate the Rule. \* *Antoniode Dominis*, Arch-

\* L. 3. c. 2. num.  
418, 419.

Canon Nicænus excludit duos Episcopos inter se divisos, non autem duos in se conjunctos, & in uno regimine amicè copulatos.

bishop of *Spalato*, hath excellently well given the Church's sense of it in these words: *The Nicene Canon* (saith he) *exclud's two Bishops divided among themselves but not two conjoyn'd in themselves, and friendly coupled in the same Government:* I do further observe, in the third place,

3; That this settlement in *Antioch* was not made, but upon an antecedent previous consent, and interpretative, if not express resignation, not only of *Paulinus* and *Meletius*, who were the present actual Pretenders (and the right to the whole City was certainly in one of them) but of all the Clergy; i. e. the Presbyters that were pretenders in reversion, and might expect the Chair by a vacancy: Our Historians add, that all this was ratified by Oath between the Parties. And here Doctor *Hody* may find, that these two Bishops in the Church of God, than whom there were not any that have been more faithful and

[Sac. l. 3. c. 5.

† Soc. l. 7. c. 3.



and courageous in it during *Constantius's* persecution; or that have received more, and more honorable Eulogies for it; these (I say) together with the rest of the Orthodox in the City of *Antioch*, were not of his mind, when he thus \* declares: \* *Pag. 7.*  
*Other men I must leave to their own ways of thinking; for my part, I cannot imagine that the welfare and prosperity of mankind does depend upon so ticklish and uncertain a point as that of an ejected Governor's consent: That if he refuses to give his consent, all the Church must be made a Sacrifice to him.* For, it is very manifest, that this Church of *Antioch* was in great distraction, and must in course have been sacrificed by its Schisms, which always bring ruine, if it had not been prevented by this amicable consent: And our great *Meletius* is, on the one hand, an immediate President to all ejected Governors; and they are taught by this his practice, that it is their duty, to recede from their own personal rights, upon a prospect of the Church's just settlement by it: And *Paulinus's* practice on the other hand, teaches all Intruders, that the way to the Church's just settlement, upon a Schism made by them, and to prevent it being made a *Sacrifice*, is the *ejected Governor's consent*: To be sure nothing was done in this affair at *Antioch* without *Meletius's* knowledge and approbation: And no body but the unthinking Doctor can conceive, that, since Christ has so ordered the *Oeconomy* of his Government, that it is placed in the hands of particular Bishops, seated in their respective Districts, for the preservation of its peace and unity; it can be wrested out of their hands irregularly, and without their consent, or, which must be the same thing, contrary to Christ's disposal and *Oeconomy*, at the pleasure of the Prince, or one or more Bishops, or any *Irresistible Party*, and the Church, *i. e.* its constitution and peace not to be sacrificed by it, since all is directly laid open to every pretender that is successful.

It is true, that *Meletius's* justice for this Churches peace, and even *Paulinus's*, had not its design'd effect; and the difference in *Antioch* was palliated, not cured, by it: For upon *Meletius's* death, *Flavianus* ascended his Throne, whilst *Paulinus* was alive; and several of the Believers hatred to him for it was such, in that he broke his Oath, and the peace of the Church, that they refused to communicate with him, and made separate \* Conventions: And *Paulinus* died a little after; which made the breach wider, † *Evagrius* being consecrated in his room:

\* *Socr. l. 5. c. 15.*\* *Socr. l. 7. c. 11. 15.*† *Ibid.*

And

and thus both the Sects were revived, and continued as at the first : and held opposite communion; even when \* *Evagrius* was dead : (which happen'd a little after) by reason of the irreconcilable aversion, which *Paulinus's* party retain'd towards *Flavianus*, tho' *Evagrius* had no Successor : and the † *Eastern* and *Western* Churches were concern'd, and became Parties in it. But notwithstanding, God's good providence so ordered it, that *Evagrius's* death became a step and means to that rightful Union, which was wrought ‖ among them in tract of time ; and an end was put to that Schism which began in the latter end of *Constantines* Reign, upon the removal of *Eustathius* : and the *Eusebians* erecting their succession upon it, and continued near an hundred years : \* *Baronius* says it lasted till the year 408. when Pope *Innocent* put an end to it, with some difficulty. But † *Theodorus Lector* says, it continued an hundred years after *Eustathius's* death : if so ; it lasted fifty years, at least, after *Innocent's* time ; though, strictly speaking, the Schism, which began upon *Eustathius's* removal, ended in *Meletius's* lawful possession of the *Antiochian* See : *Eustathius* resigning unto him, when he had declar'd for the *Nicene* Faith ; he being the last of the *Sophronian* Succession, and the immediate lawful Bishop of *Antioch* to *Eustathius* : for, by this time the *Eusebians* had pull'd off their Mask ; ( of which I am to give an account at large in the sequel of this Tract ) and tho' they did not cease to place their own Bishops in *Antioch*, upon *Meletius's* disappointing them, by his turning Catholick, and receiving that Chair in a just Succession, upon true Church Terms ; yet they did not continue them there, as Successors to *Sophronius*, ( who was the first Bishop brought in upon *Eustathius* ) and lawful Possessors, by reason of *Eustathius's* abdication : but as *Exoukourian Arians* ; in which Sect they founded a new Succession, upon *Meletius's* deposition and banishment : out of which the *Eusebians*, who had asserted the eternal generation, as the *Homousians*, who abated nothing of the *Nicene* explication, were alike excluded. Now after this Schism thus ended, the same deposition and banishment of *Meletius* occasion'd another : for in his absence, *Lucifer Calaritanus* coming to *Antioch*, and finding it without a Bishop, upon a presumption, surely, that *Meletius* was then dead, he enthron'd *Paulinus* in that Chair : whereupon, the *Eustathians*, who had adher'd to *Eustathius* their Bishop, and to *Meletius* as his true Successor, divided themselves into two parties, but went under the name of *Eustathians* ; and the one communion :

\* *Soc. l. 5. c. 15.*

† *Socrat.*  
*ibid. supra.*

‖ *Theodor.*  
*l. 5. c. 23.*

\* *An. 381.*

† *P. 437.*

communicated under *Meletius*, and the other under *Paulinus*; when both were Orthodox; till, some time after, *Meletius* and *Paulinus* accommodated the business between them: and though the Schism return'd, and was continu'd after their deaths, it did not last very long; as I have shew'd in the foregoing Paragraph.

Thus our good God, by vertue of his promise once made to his Church, always preserves a due succession, by the means of some choice men, whom he raises up for that purpose: and his wisdom finds a way by which her dissentions are overul'd, notwithstanding the Schisms and Heresies which must be, i.e. though the lusts and revenge of men will always so far prevail, as to raise and continue them for a while; (for thence their necessity comes) and the Gates of Hell shall not prevail against her.

Having in the third Paragraph preceeding, produced *Theodorus's* authority to prove a farther continuance of the *Eustathian* separation, than some men have allow'd, I do not think fit to dismiss him so: but shall reassume him, to make good a point, which will be of greater concern, and bring more advantage not only to the present subject, but even to our common Christianity: for since he \* tells us, that the *Eustathians* separated, and held communion a part, by reason *Eustathius* their Bishop, who was wrongfully remov'd from the *Antiochian* See; and the separation continued an hundred years after *Eustathius's* death; it is hence as plain as any thing needs be; at least, it hath as much authority as the Historian can give it; that the separate communion, which the *Eustathians* first held, was not made upon the account of *Sophronius's* *Arianism*, or his Successors; but because they were brought into *Eustathius's* See, when he was lawfully possessed, and fill'd it upon Church Terms, and it was not justly voided: tho' the *Eustathians* separated, the *Sophronians* were the Schismatics, and had the guilt of it: but this will be hence prov'd with greater and more notorious conviction, from the continuance of the Schism: (it matters not whether it was one and the same) for though some have mistook, and represented *Sophronius*, and his Successors in *Antioch*, down to *Meletius*, as *Arian* Hereticks; and those that say, the *Eustathians* separated from them for that reason, may have a pretence for their opinion; none ever pretended that *Paulinus*, and the rest of the Bishops of *Antioch*, from his time, to the time of the continuance of that separation, which a Majority of the *Eustathians* made from them, and

\* *Collectan.*  
l. 2. in *Initio.*  
Οἱ δὲ διὰ τὸν  
μετὰ τὸν  
ἀποχρισμένους,  
τῶ ἐκκλη-  
σία ὑπάρχοντες  
μετὰ ἀκρίστον  
ἐπὶ τῇ δαυδατῇ  
ἰουδαίᾳ.

and lasted, according to *Theodorus*, till an hundred years after *Eustathius*'s death; these Bishops, I say, were never suspected by any to be *Arians*; and it was alone upon the account of *Paulinus*'s assuming *Meletius*'s Chair whilst he was alive, and his Successors continuing the injustice, or the *Eustathians* supposing it to be continued, which occasion'd the foremention'd Moiety of them to make a separate Congregation in *Antioch*, and refuse to communicate with them.

\* L. 5. c. 23.  
H. E.

*Theodorus* \* tells us (and he alone of our Historians) that *Paulinus* assign'd and consecrated *Evagrius* for his Successor a little before he died, and by his single hands, without his Brethren: which, if true, adds a great deal to the disadvantage of them both: especially in regard to their falseness to their Oaths and Compact: as men once dipt in Schism are hardly brought again to a consistency and integrity: tho' *Baronius* is of the opinion, that *Theodorus* mistook this circumstance; and that he might be inclinable to look with less diligence into that affair, by reason of the great affection, even to partiality, which he all along shew'd unto *Flavianus*. And † *Natalis Alexander* (who seems to be the more exquisite and unbiass'd Historian of the two) relates it diffidently as to its Truth: but no one questions *Theodorus*'s relation in another place, where he tells us, that the Fathers in the second general Council, held at *Constantinople*, did approve and receive *Flavianus*'s ordination and succession to *Meletius*, contrary to their Settlement at *Antioch*; which recommends his Cause to the World, with much seeming advantage. Now, because the Reader may justly require some satisfaction concerning it, I shall give him *Gregory Nazianzens*'s account of it, who tells us,

† De Eccles.  
*Antioch*, Schism.

|| L. 5. c. 9.

' That *Flavianus*'s Num. —

*Carm. de vita*  
*ejus a num.*  
121. ad num.  
158. Ed. Paris.

' Cause was carried in  
' the Synod by the ju-  
' nior Bishops, who  
' made the greater  
' number, and over-  
' rul'd the elders, and  
' so far prevail'd upon  
' them, that they made  
' them on their side,  
' through their rio-  
' tous, insolent and  
' clamorous proceed-  
' ings and behaviour.

137.

οἱ δ' ἐκρωζον ἄλλος ἄλλοθεν,  
δῆμος κηλοῖων εἰς ἓν ἐσκαυασμένος,  
τύρβη νέων τις, καὶ νὺν ἐργάσμενον,  
οἷς ἔδ' ἄν ἤξιωσε τῶν τις ἐντολῶν  
φύβω τε δέω καὶ θρόνῳ δύναι λόγον.

138.

Τοῖς δ' ἡκαλέθεν ἡ σεμνὴ γερουσία.

139.

Πᾶσι βοῶμεν· ὅς θελ' δύνει σίτω.

' That

'That these young-

'er Bishops, who

'carried it, in the

'Synod, against *Paulinus*,

'were a sort

'of men of a tem-

'porary Faith, who

'had ran with the

'Times, accordingly

'as they were suc-

'cessful; when the

'Orthodox were per-

'secuted, in the

'Reign of *Valens*,

'they were *Arians*;

'when *Gratian* and

'*Theodosius* protected

'the Catholicks, and

'would permit none

'to enjoy their Bi-

'shopricks, unless

'they would sub-

'scribe the Doctrine

'of *one Substance*,

'they were *Homousi-*

'*ans*.

'That their mu-

'table complexion

'instructed them

'likewise to receive

'any Bishop, if a

'Possessor, without

'any regard to his

'Church Right, and

'lawful Succession;

'but it was all one

'to them if *Paulinus*

'*Flavianus* or *Eusebius*

'a *Schismatick*, *Ho-*

'*mousian* or an *Ari-*

142. Ταύτην ἰώρων ἀλμυρῶν ἐκπύρου  
τῷ ἀμφιδόξων ἀδελφῶν δορυμνήν.

vid. Jac.  
Billi Schol. in  
not. 123.

143. Οἱ ταῦτα δοξάζουσι οἱ χαίρει καίτοι,  
μέσσοι μὲν ὄντες, ἀσμένισον δ' εἰ μέσσοι  
καὶ μὴ περδὴλως κλήσεως ἐναντίας.  
ἐπισκοποῦν ὡς μενδάνοντες τὸν θεόν,  
διδάσκαλοι χυδῆς καὶ μεδμηταὶ σήμερον,

144. Τελειοποιοὶ καὶ τέλειοι δευτερον.

146. Καὶν δευτερος τίς ἡ πολυτερος τῶ-  
χῃ.

πανηγυρεῖς ἐσημεῖν ἀπὶ τῶ μηδὲ  
ἀπεργματῆτος, ἀν μεταστραφῇ κῶ-  
εος

(χαρὶς γὰρ ἐδὲν ἐστὶν εὐτεροφώτερον)  
ἐχῆς τὸ πεχνύδριον, ἐκδεσμε πό-  
λων,

καὶ εὐμαδὲς πῖσι τὸ περσκειῶναι μιᾷ  
βίαν δὲ πολλὰς εἰδέναι διεξόχως.

Μωαβίταις καὶ Ἀμμωνίταις οἷς οὐ  
πάλα,

ὡς ἐισιτητὸν ἐστὶ εἰς ἐκκλησίαν.



an, presided over  
 them in their as-  
 semblies, and wor-  
 ship, as the head  
 of their communion;  
 they could receive  
 two Bishops in the  
 same district, and at  
 the same time, tho'  
 they opposed one  
 another, and the  
 Churches Law.

Our excellent Bi-  
 shop, out of his a-  
 bundance of zeal for  
 Peace and Truth,  
 exhorts them 'To  
 take better advice of  
 him, and lay down  
 their pretended pleas  
 in behalf of *Flavi-*  
*anus*, and receive  
*Paulinus*, who is  
 the rightful Bishop  
 of *Antioch*, he hav-  
 ing been placed  
 there together with  
*Meletius*, and ap-  
 pointed for the sole  
 Bishop in that Ci-  
 ty, upon his death,  
 by the consent of  
 all the Clergy, who  
 then were, or could  
 be supposed to be,  
 concern'd in that  
 affair, and the pre-  
 sent Possessor; and  
 not to make a new  
 Bishop, till death,

122. Σπουδὴν ἔχοντες ἀνταναστήσαι τινα,  
 πρὸς ἑξῆς ἄλλον τῷ τῶς μονοθεῶν.

130. — — καὶ δεξιὰ ἐμὴ λόγον,  
 λόγον παρεμνηθεῖς, τῷ νέων σοφώτε-  
 ρον  
 θεόνος κρατέιδω τῷ κρατύντι νῦν  
 πῶς  
 τί δεινόν, ἂν τι καὶ μακρόν παλαιοῦ  
 χρόνον  
 τὸν ἀνδρα πενήσωμεν, ὡς παλαιό-  
 μος;  
 ἐπεὶ δὲ δώσει τὴν λύσιν τῷ πρέσβυτι  
 τῷ ἡέρας,

Ἡμεῖς δὲ τηλικαῦτα ἐκ συμφορίας  
 λαῶν ὅ παντὸς καὶ σοφῶν ἐπισκόπων  
 θεῶν τὴν ἄλλον δώσωμεν σὺν πνεύ-  
 ματι  
 ὡδ' ἂν γένοιτο τῷ κακῶν λύσις.  
 μία.

133. Μικρόν τι νικηθῶμεν, ὥστε περισ-  
 λαβεῖν  
 νίκην πλείω, καὶ τὸ σωθῆναι θῶ,  
 κῆσθον τι σῶσαι τὸν κακῶς ὁλωλότα

or some just occasion, has made the See void, upon Church Terms:

He tells them roundly, ' That since *Paulinus* is a rightful Possessor, and not under the visible breach of any Church Law, even a general Council has not a right to inspect him, or to but debate his removal; much less to bring in another Bishop upon him: a full See is a Sacred Thing; and none but seditious and evil Men will attempt such things.

He shews them them the several great inconveniences and destructive consequences which will attend the affecting their design upon *Paulinus*, and place *Flavianus* in his Chair:

As

' That such a schismatical action will bring a guilt upon those that then commit it, and all such as in the future comply with

123. Βαλὴ ὃ πρὸς κείνῳ ἡμῶν ἐβουλευτήα,  
ἣν οἱ πασι δέεσσι καὶ κακῶς συνεκέρ-  
τουν.

131. Οἰκτον λάβωμεν τοῦ τε νῦν ἐχρισ-  
μένων,  
τῶν τ' ἐγγύς ὄντων τοῦ πάσης, τοῦ  
θ' ὕστερον.

'it, whom he pities  
'and laments.

\* That the Faith,  
'and most holy and  
'venerable Doctrine  
'of Christianity will  
'be hazarded, if  
'not Shipwreck'd by  
'it, and this is so  
'visible, that no eye  
'can chuse but see  
'it.

\* That the Go-  
'vernment of the  
'Church will fail,  
'and be destroy'd  
'by such proceed-  
'ings, and anarchy  
'be the effect of it, to  
'the shame and grief  
'of good men.

And after all this,  
when the good Bi-  
shop found that his  
endeavours had no  
other effect upon  
them, then to wi-  
den the Churches  
breaches, and 'en-  
'flame their heats and  
'oppositions; he stir-  
'ring only a Wasps  
'nest, and bringing  
'Stones, and new  
'Turmoils upon him-  
'self, by reason of  
'it: in the last  
'place,

'He chooses ra-  
'ther to quit the

132. Μή τις δελήσῃ τοῦ προβήσῃται μαθῶν,  
εἰ τὰντα κινήσειεν ἐν μακρῷ χρόνῳ.  
ὅτι ξυρῶ βεβήκεν ἡ σωζομένη ἐτι  
τὸ σμῦνὸν ἡμῶν δόγμα, καὶ σεβάσμιον,  
ἢ μήκετ' εἶναι τῇ φάσει διαρρύν.

147. Οἱ σύλλογοι μὲν ἦσαν, ὧν ἦσαν τότε.  
(ὁκνῶ γὰρ εἰπεῖν αὐτοῖς, οἷς αἰχλύνο-  
μαι)  
ἦσαν δὲ πάντων· ἴσον εἶπεν ἐδενός.  
ἀναρχία γὰρ ἔστιν ἡ πλεισταρχία.

137. Λαίλαψ κόνιν σύρσας πνευμάτων  
στάσις.

138. Ἀπαικτα παρλάζωσι ἡσθηκῶν δὲ  
κην.

133. ——— Τὸ σὺν λίθαις  
κήρυγμα λαμπερὸν τῆς ἡμῶν παρ-  
ρησίας.

135. Ἡμῶν δὲ συγχωρήσας ἀδελφον βίον,  
ἄλλῳ τοῦτο

'Synod and his Bi-  
 'shoprick, and live  
 'an obscure private  
 'life, then comply  
 'with these unjust,  
 'and unigospel Pro-  
 'ceedings.

τὸν ἀκλεῖν μὲν, ἀλλ' ὁμῶς αἰν-  
 δυνον·  
 χροιάσμε' ἔλθων οἱ κακῶν ἔρημια.  
 χροιάσον γδ, ἢ τοῖς πλῆσιον μεμεγ-  
 μένον,  
 μήτ' ἄλλον ἔλκειν πρὸς τὸ βέλημ'  
 ἰχθύειν  
 μήτ' αὐτὸν ἄλλοις συμφέρεσθ', ἢ μὴ  
 λόγος.

149. Τὶ δ'εἰ λέγειν ὅσοις πρὸ οἰοῖς λόγους  
 ταύτην ἐπέφωκ' τὴν πολίαν φίλτα-  
 τοι.

151. Τὰ πρῶτα μὲν διδόντες αἰτῶντες ὃ  
 γέ  
 τὶ γνήσιοι φέω γρηγόρεον τὸν γνή-  
 σιον,

152. "Οἱ γνήσιοι μὲν, εἰς ὃ σύμπνοια κα-  
 κῶν.  
 τὸ ὃ εἶναι, εἰς ἅπαντα συνεργῶντ' ἔ-  
 χειν·  
 πᾶς εἰς ἅπαντα ὃ τίς καὶ ἐφαντασίη  
 τῶσιν.

"Ἡ τί περδύσῃ πῆς ἐμῆς σωτηρίας·  
 ἐντεῦθεν ἐξέκλεπτον ὅκα μέσθ' ἀπό-  
 δα.

'Upon this, the 152. Βοῶντες ἰκόντες, εἰς δεὸν χρέα  
 'People, with others,  
 much bemoan'd his

'depar-

'departure, lament-  
 'ing him as a man  
 'that was dead;  
 'and solicited him to  
 'continue with them,  
 'in affecting Ora-  
 'tory; As will you  
 'leave us, your la-  
 'bour in the Lord,  
 'when you have  
 'brought us to ma-  
 'turity? Who shall  
 'take care of your  
 'charge? Have some  
 'regard to the  
 'Work of your Mi-  
 'nisty, which of  
 'a small Remnant,  
 'is become a great  
 'Multitude. But these  
 'things did not move  
 'him so far as to in-  
 'duce him to change  
 'his purpose; he  
 'thought he was  
 'more oblig'd to keep  
 'himself clear of  
 'their notorious  
 'Schism, in bring-  
 'ing two Bishops in-  
 'to one City, of  
 'which he apprehen-  
 'ded he could not  
 'wholly be acquit-  
 'ed, if he continued in the Colledge, or not so fully, than  
 'to officiate in his Episcopal Function; and chose rather, upon  
 'this seeming competition, to forego the latter, than hazard the  
 'disrepute, he was to undergo in closing, though but in appearance  
 'with the former.

αἶροντες, ὀρκίζοντες, ὡς τεθνηκότα  
 πενθύντες ἡδὴ.

Ἡμεῖς ἀφήσεις, τὸν σὸν (ὡς ἀνέκο-  
 μεν)

εἰχὺν σένον ποτ', εὐχομεν ὅτι νῦν διέξῃς.

— Τίς σὸν ἐξέρχεται τόπον;

τῆς σὺς πόνευς τίμησον,

διὸς τῆς πνοῆς τὸ λείπον ἡμῶν καὶ  
 θεῶ.



I am not ignorant that Doctor *Hody* makes use of \* *St Gregory's* Resignation, to the prejudice, as he thinks, of our present deprived Bishops : And he urges it as an obligation upon them to resign also to their present Intruders and Possessors : He even, upbraids them because they have not done it, as coming short therein, of the pious and peaceable temper of this most exemplary Prelate: But he argues, as he usually does, upon a mistaken bottom : For,

1. The Doctor ought to prove, e're he makes his Inference from it, that *St. Gregory* was so far exemplary in his Resignation, as that it hath been since, and is now, a crime not to imitate him in it. Was it not his saylure, to yeild to the present Emergency, and Resign ? Ought he not, with the other Bishops, who stood out, to have adher'd to *Paulinus*, against *Flavianus*, and asserted his Right, which he own'd, not by abdicating ; but, by continuing in his Chair, and in the exercise of his Jurisdiction ; so long as he might have done it without sin, and he was not disenabled in his person to do it, by the force of his Enemies ? Would he not have done more service to the Church of God by it, then by resigning ? If every Christian Bishop should be of his mind, under the same, or the like, Exigency, what would become of the Unity, Government, the, even, being of the Church of God ? He is really, and indispensably, imitable in opposing *Flavianus*, and not partaking in the guilt, which he would have necessarily incurr'd, by abetting a Schismatical Possessor, whose Chair was full, upon his Possession ; but might he not have found out a better and more approv'd way of manifesting his opposition to his Usurpation, and vindicating his Innocency ; then by laying down his Ministry ? He that truly thinks will not say that *St. Gregory* is imitable in this ; but will own that it was one of those *new* and imperfections, which good and great men have some times about them. A Bishop ought not to consult his quiet, even a more frequent opportunity of saying his prayers, as it is plain † he did, in laying down his Bishoprick, when the constitution and peace of the Church are at the stake ; as he acknowledg'd they were, upon the opposition *Paulinus* met with, through the headiness of the junior Bishops in the Council of *Constantinople*. And the † complacency which he seems to have taken in a fit of sickness, which seiz'd him, and justified his absence from the Synod to *Theodosius*, though it was

\* Prefat. ad  
MS. Baroc. The  
case of the Sees,  
p. 197.

† Ep. 55. ad  
Procopium.

‡ Επειδὴ καλῶς  
ἢ ὅσως πρὸς  
εἰρήνην, Carm. de  
vita ejus. num.  
148.

next

\* *Ibid.*

next unto || death, argues something that was humane in him, and not his virtue. And his Character, upon Doctor *Hody's* supposition, who makes it the effect of his full deliberation, and his virtue can be little less then that which our Saviour gives the *Hireling* in the Gospel, *Who runs away when the Wolf is coming, and careth not for the Sheep*: The true Shepherds character, who lays down his life for his Sheep, will hardly belong unto him. But then,

2. If we allow his Resignation to be commendable, and to be imitable: Wherein is his case, and the case of our *deprived* Bishops so alike, as to be the same? Is their parity such, as to admit a true and thorow arguing from the one to the other? If this be a due arguing it will: *viz.* because St. *Gregory*, in a kind of despondency, apprehended that he was unable to discharge his Episcopal function, by reason partly, of his bodily indisposition, partly, of his enemies opposition to him, who threatned his \* deprivation, partly out of his desire of a private life, resign'd his See, whereby it became legally void, and the † *People and Bishops* elected another into it; therefore, our present *deprived* Bishops ought, in imitation of him, to resign, upon the *unjust and uncanonical deprivation* of the Secular Arm, or the Majority of a Council, and receive their illegal Bishops, placed in their own full Sees, by those powers. If St. *Gregory* had been in possession of *Antioch*, as *Paulinus* was; or those *Egyptian* and *Macedonian* Bishops, whom he || mentions, had unduly depriv'd him, and brought *Flavianus*, or another Bishop, into his See, being full, as they brought *Flavianus* into *Antioch*, and St. *Gregory* had resign'd, and receiv'd them; upon this his example, there might be some shew of a plea, for the validity of *unjust and uncanonical Deprivations*; and our *deprived* Bishops, might be urg'd to resign likewise, with an appearance of some reason for it, upon St. *Gregory's* example: But it is altogether unaccountable, that St. *Gregory* should be urg'd as another Pattern for it, since it cannot be prov'd that he would have resign'd upon such considerations; since his Resignation was not made upon any such considerations; since we have all the reason in the world to believe he would not, because he censur'd and condemn'd such an intrusion in *Flavianus*, and loaded it with the foulest guilt, as I have above given an account, and may be seen \* more largely: Did he not refuse to receive him as his Colleague? And the avoiding the Schism of that action is one reason of his resignation: And the other old Bishops, that were overvoted by the younger,

\* *Vid. num.*153, 154, 155.  
in *car. de vita sua.*† *Ibid. num.*  
130.|| *Ibid. num.*  
153.\* *Ibid. supra.*

younger, did not receive *Flavianus*, but made a separation from them upon it; as it is well known in our Church Story. And all the use that I know the Doctor can make of this *Constantinopolitan* affair, and St. Gregory's Resignation, is; that, since St. Gregory made an invective against the Majority of the second General Council which was held there, and condemn'd it, in that it brought *Flavianus* into a full See, *Paulinus*, the rightful Proprietor, being then alive; and for that reason, among some others, chose rather to quit his Bishoprick, then to seem, by holding it, and communicating with those Bishops, who did it, to countenance, and partake of the sin of so vile an action; since St. Gregory \* was so highly offended with the Council for it, and not being able to master his resentment, in the heat of his passion, resolved never to come into a Synod more, and hastily said, that he never knew one that had a good event. Such a sense had he of the impiety of this proceeding; what then? Therefore, the Prince, the Mob, any thing that hath power enough, may without plea of right, deprive a Bishop, and bring in a Possessor, and the Depriv'd is oblig'd to resign, and receive, and communicate with him: Surely, a hopeful consequence: But tho' the Doctor has not, we have learn'd to make better use of the rash proceedings of these temporizing young Bishops, and the Elder's mean compliance with them, which is.

\* *Epist. 55.  
ad Procop.*

That the Nature and Constitution of the Christian Commonwealth, and the obligation of Obedience to its Decisions, even those that are made in a General Council, do not engage a Christian at large, nor yet a Christian Officer and Bishop, who is a Member of that Council, to submit unto them upon the forementioned terms: I mean when a pack of pretended Converts, shall, by their number and turbulency, to vindicate thereby their own naughty practices of the same nature, overthrow a first principle, receiv'd from Christ, together with the incorporation, which he instituted and founded in his Blood; and erect a false Communion under *Peter*, or *Paul*, or *Apollos*; or in opposition to them, or any one of them, by deserting the proper Bishop, or bringing in a false Bishop upon him; so that two Bishops are in the same District, at the same time: Even, the most holy of Bishops have not a right to determine, and oblige, the subject upon such terms. And tho' the hundred and fifty, which made this General

Council at *Constantinople* ( for, notwithstanding that our Historians failing often in our *Chronology*, give us some occasion to think this Vote was passed in a Council held at *Constantinople*, subsequent to the other just now mentioned, called the third Council at *Constantinople*, the † contrary is made apparent ) I say, though those Bishops had been Orthodox in their Faith, and unspotted in their manners, and had then made the Decision ; St. *Gregory* had forfeited his Title, *the Divine*, if he had not declar'd against their proceedings, and the improbity of them ; and dissented from them in the same manner he hath done.

It is own'd to be the proper work of a General Council to determine the rights of Bishops, when they fall under debate, and the Bishops and Clergy of the Neighbourhood cannot do it : And thus the cases of *Maximus Cynicus*, and St. *Gregory of Nazianzum* were adjusted by the same Council of *Constantinople*, when *Theophilus of Alexandria*, and his *Egyptian* Bishops had consecrated *Maximus* Bishop there, upon their own Authority, and Schismatically ; and he was ejected upon the Antient Church Rules and Grounds, and *Gregory* fixed in that See : The Synod could no more have settled them both in it, by bringing the one upon the other, vested with the same rights, to be promiscuously exercised by both, and in opposition to one another, contrary to the antecedent immutable Government founded in *Christ* \* crucified ( for his Cross reconcil'd us to God, and constituted his Church and his respective Bishops in it, as *Peter* and *Paul* : And the effects of the Cross are voyded in eluding the one as well as the other ) then it could have made its own definition of Faith, in opposition to that which was once deliver'd to the Saints : In which case all men believe that Christians are no ways oblig'd to receive, and submit to it ; nor to an Angel from Heaven : And, accordingly, the true Church hath adher'd to its proper Bishops and to its Faith, upon the same bottom, and by the same obligations, as I shall shew in the following Chapters : And if a Council does act contrary to a first Principle, as the Council of *Constantinople* ( the Majority over ruling ) did in the case of *Flavianus* ; the remonstrance of a *Gregory Nazianzen*, a *Cyril of Jerusalem*, a *Meletius of Antioch*, or the like Elder and well grounded Prelates, is notwithstanding, to oblige us, and become our rule, especially, against a more numerous Company of young Divines, and *Latitudinarian* Bishops, who at first betray'd their Faith

† Vid. Natal.  
Alexand. hist.  
Eccles. secul.  
4. pars prima.  
p. 233.

\* 1 Cor. cap. 1.  
§ 3d.  
Non videtur ab  
his exhiberi a  
Christo fides, a  
quibus evacua-  
tur ejus passio-  
nis corpusq; distra-  
hitur. Ambros. in  
funere satyri.



Faith and Obedience by closing with Heresy and Schism, and afterwards professed *Homouſianism*; to preſerve thoſe Biſhopriks, which their firſt perfidiouſneſs had obtain'd. And that rule which Cardinal *Baronius* lays down and propoſes; *That this Synod of Conſtantinople may be receiv'd or reject'd in its Determinations, accordingly as it is found to have obſerved it*, is firm and good, and is to be our guid in the like caſes; which requires, that nothing which is new be put in the Synods Determinations, but that only which is *Anciently deliver'd, prov'd by the Divine Scriptures, preſerv'd by the ancient Faſthers, and declar'd by the latter Doct'rs*. Though the Learned *Annaliſt* will be found at another time, to be as uneaſy under this Rule, as ſome others are: neither hath he here made uſe of it, but to ſerve a turn, and thereby overthrow ſome Cãons, which the Council hath made, and he concludes to be innovations; eſpecially that one which brings *Conſtantinople* too near *Rome* in its Priviledges. And we have this advantage by it; that as our Church in her *one and thirtieth Article* hath ſaid, that *General Councils may erre, and ſometimes have err'd in things pertaining to God*, ſo a Cardinal of *Rome* hath acknowledg'd the ſame. For, ſurely, *Romes* Univerſal Paſtorſhip is accounted by him to be among the things that pertain to God. Is it not reputed by the *Romaniſt* as a firſt Truth, even no leſs then an Article of Faith?

\* An. 381 pag. 436.

† Ut pote nihil præterea novi in ea appoſuiſſent, ſed quod antiquius traditum, divinis Scripturis probatum, a veteribus cuſtoditum, & a recentioribus declaratum.

And now, I have done with theſe five Biſhops, viz. *Euthimius, Meletius, Paulinus, Flavjanus* and *Evagrius*, who made great figures in their times; and not only *Antioch*, but the whole Church has been concern'd upon ſome Emergencies, which happen'd by reaſon of them. I did not think that I ſhould have inſiſted ſo long here as I have done: But new conſiderations ſtill aroſe, and I was the more willing to dwell upon them, becauſe the Doct'or even triumphs, upon the advantages which he thinks he has from them: Though it is upon a bottom, which I have ſhew'd to be ſandy all along, but here more particularly: Indeed, each circumſtance, throughout the whole Story, ſtrengthens our cauſe againſt him: And if any one ſhall ſo far concern himſelf with that, which I have here taken notice of, and made my obſervations upon, as to think it too long; I expect, that the weightineſs, and preſent uſefulneſs of the matter ſhould be ſome plea for me: The ſubject is comprehensive enough to make a diſtinct Tract, and deſerves



it : I am not ignorant that some part of it is variously related by our Historians : Especially that concerning *Eustatbius* : and if any find fault that I have not clear'd the Story, as he may think I ought to have done, because I suppose some things, and acquiesce in them, as truth's, which are impugn'd by others; I need not undertake a vindication of my self upon this account : For, if there were two *Eustatbius's*, the one Bishop of *Sebastia*, the other of *Antioch* ; it is no matter, then, where the former was, when *Meletius* was made Bishop of *Antioch* : That See could not then be filled by him : Again, if there was but one *Eustatbius*, and he was translated from *Sebastia*, or deposed, and upon repentance admitted to *Berea*, and thence to *Antioch*, by the Council of *Nicea* : Whether he was afterwards legally deposed and remov'd from *Antioch*, in *Constantine's* days, or illegally and ineffectually, but, being banish'd, never appear'd, and his Chair became a *Derelictum*; or, whether he was dead and voyded it that way ; or remain'd alive, and appear'd afterwards, but resign'd his right of *Antioch*, before *Meletius* was rightfully possessed of it : as it is variously argu'd and concluded ; if, I say, any of them hold, it must sink the Doctor's plea, which he makes with a great deal of assurance : viz. That *Eustatbius* was invalidly depriv'd, and alive, and exercised his function over the *Antiochians*, and had not resign'd, when *Meletius* was possessed of that See : And consequently, *Meletius's*, coming to *Antioch* is not a competent plea for the Doctor's Second, or Successor. And the great and most Catholick Principle ; viz. One Bishop at one time, in one and the same District, is not violated through *Meletius's* Example.

---

## CHAP. II. SECT. I.

**I** Come now, in this second Chapter, according to my designed Method, to shew, that during the Reigns of *Constantine* and *Constantius*, the Empire was not reputed, upon Catholick Principles, and by the Catholicks of that time, (or even by most of the Hereticks) to be vested with a Right to abdicate a Bishop, when a Possessor; and by virtue of such his Abdication, or Déposition, to acquit his people of their dependance upon him: No, though he was in his person, rendred incapable to exercise his Pastoral Function among them. Nor was

was the said Secular Power thought to be competent to enthronè a Bishop, and rightfully possess him of an Episcopal Chair, though it was vacant upon terms which the Church allows, nor could it by virtue of that Possession enable him to demand obedience of the Officers, and other Believers, within that District ; nor to lay an obligation on the said Officers and Believers, to receive and obey him ; it being only the Church hands, that were then believed to be capable of doing this : And further, that if any Emperor, or other incompetent Power, has attempted, and effected such a thing, and so depriv'd, or, dispossest a Bishop ; a competent number of the Colledge, or Episcopal Fraternity, and of others Christians, that were truly conscientious, did always remonstrate upon Gospel principles, and adhere notwithstanding to the rightful Bishop, and reject the Interloper.

Now, in pursuance of this, I shall begin with *Constantine* whose principle was asserted and manifested by him, in the case of *Cæcilianus* and *Majorinus*, when both of them were vested by their several Parties, and contended for their respective rights in the Archbishoprick of *Carthage* ; and the latter call'd the Emperor in as their Judge ; being well assur'd, that the whole action will be found an undeniable and irrefragable evidence on our side. For, in this great affair *Constantine* did not stand a neuter, but disclaim'd all right to be a Judge in it ; as what belong'd only to Church-men, and would be an *Usurpation* upon the Law of God in him, if he should undertake it. And for the making this appear, I need only state the case, and declare the proceedings upon it, on the Churches, and on the Emperor's side : Which is this, according to the account that our Church-Historians, if *St. Austin* may be reckon'd among them, have given us of it. \*

When *Mensurius* Bishop of *Carthage* dyed, *Cæcilianus*, the Arch-deacon of that Church, was elected Bishop in his room, and consecrated by *Felix Aptungentensis*, who was a Neighbour Bishop, ( according to the practice of the Church in *St. Cyprian's* days ) *Botrus* and *Celeustus*, two Presbyters that contended for it, being rejected. *Cæcilianus*, entering upon his Charge, demanded the Church Vessels and Ornaments, which *Mensurius* left in the hands of the Elders of the Church, when *Maxentius* the Tyrant sent for him to *Rome*, by reason that he had conceal'd *Felix*, a certain Deacon, who had wrote a notable Epistle

\* Vid. Aug. l. de Heres. c. 69. Et Brevicul. collationis di. 3. Et Ep. 62. Et l. 3. contra Crescon. gramat. c. 28, 29. Et lib. de Univ. Eccles. c. ult. † Factus est Episcopus a plurimis collegis nostris, qui tunc in urbe Roma aderant. Cyp. Ep. 2. l. 4. de Com.

against

against him ; but these Elders refus'd to deliver the Church-goods, or to Communicate with *Cæcilianus* ; and joyning themselves with *Botrus* and *Celeustus*, ( who were discontented because they mis'd the Bishoprick ) and *Lucilla*, a rich and potent Widow, whom *Cæcilianus* had justly censur'd when he was Archdeacon : By the concurrence of these three causes , viz. \* The wrath of a Woman, the ambition of two Presbyters, and the covetousness of the Elders, a great and flagrant Schism was soon made; which they varnish'd over with a pretence, that *Felix*, who had ordain'd *Cæcilianus* was a *Traditor* ; they aspers'd *Cæcilianus* also, that their cause might appear better to the World : And having done this, they called *Secundus Tigrisitanus*, the *Primate* of *Numidia*, and Prince of the *Traditors*, and other Bishops to *Carthage*, who there intruded *Majorinus* into that full See, and condemn'd *Cæcilianus*, in a Synod of seventy Bishops, who all were infamous *Traditors* : And it was hence that turbulent Sect, afterwards call'd *Donatists*, arose, and disturb'd the Church of God for some hundreds of years. But they did not rest satisfied in this settlement, being jealous of *Cæcilianus*'s growing power, that he might overtop them, since he had the Bishop of *Rome* on his side, and the assistance of other potent neighbouring Bishops; and, above all, the favour of *Constantine*. Hereupon they apply themselves to *Anulinus*, the Proconsul in *Africa*, and request him, that he would make their cause known to the Emperor ; which he undertook : And *Constantine* having receiv'd their Libels at his hands ; and some farther appeals in the progress of this affair, he thence took occasion to reprove and admonish them all in these words,

\* *Mulieris iracundia peperit, ambitus nutrit, avaritia roboravit. As Optatus speaks l. i. contra Parmen.*

† *Petitis a me in hoc seculo iudicium, cum ego ipse Christi iudicium expectem. Optat l. i. adv. Parmen. || Inter gesta purificationis Cæcilianus, Felicius, in fine Op. Optati Ed. Paris.*

† *Ye ask judgement of me in this world, when I my self may expect the Judgement of Christ.* Meaning, that he himself was but a Subject of the Churches, and lyable to receive judgment from *Christ*, by her hands ; as it appears by his *Epistle*, which he wrote to the *Catholic Bishops* || upon the same occasion ; where the words will be found in the same sense, tho' *Optatus* hath given us no account of it.

*Quia si nunc vera fide voluerint obsequia sanctissima Legi deferre, intelligere poterunt, quantum sibi nutu Dei provisum sit. Et hoc quidem Sanctissimi Patres, sperabam etiam in eis, quibus ingenta est maxima durities animi, posse reprehendi. Sed non profuit apud eos*

*'If these Donatists had so pleas'd, they might have known, that God had provided in his Law, that the Church only should judge in these cases. And this is so plain, that he hop'd the most hard'n'd temper might have been made sensible*

\* sensible of it. But God's favour did not  
 \* possess their senses, and that is the reason  
 \* why a true determination did them no  
 \* advantage; and God's mercy deservedly  
 \* departed from them; since it is as mani-  
 \* fest as the Sun at noon day, that they  
 \* hated the provision which God, by his  
 \* Church, hath made in these cases: What  
 \* madness is it that possesseth 'em, in that,  
 \* with an incredible arrogance, they think  
 \* they may do that which may be lawfully  
 \* neither spoke nor heard, and departing  
 \* from the rightful judgment which God  
 \* has appointed, they require my judgment,  
 \* together with the Church's? What force  
 \* of malignity is it which dwells in their  
 \* breasts? How often have they been just-  
 \* ly reprov'd by my self, for these wicked  
 \* additions to God's Word in these cases?

\* To which, if they had given any, they had not requir'd my  
 \* judgment, *who my self expect the Judgment of Christ*: For I  
 \* speak (as the truth is) that the judgment of the Priests ought  
 \* to be accounted, as when the Lord himself, residing, judgeth.

The most Holy Emperor goes on in the  
 same Epistle. 'What then do these ma-  
 \* lignant men favour, but the works of the  
 \* Devil? They diligently search after Secu-  
 \* lar things, and relinquish the Heavenly.  
 \* O outrageous and daring fury! they make  
 \* appeals, as in the causes of the *Gentiles*! What  
 \* do these undervaluers of the Law, who refuse  
 \* the Heavenly Judgment, and have deem'd  
 \* that mine should be asked? Have they had  
 \* these thoughts of Christ their Saviour? See  
 \* now the *Proditors*! Behold how themselves  
 \* have discover'd their evil deeds, without  
 \* any further strict search after them! What  
 \* civility can be expected from them, who  
 \* thus rudely have insulted upon God? But  
 \* do you (my Brethren) have patience, who  
 \* follow the ways of our Lord and Saviour,

*res a dijudicatio, neque in eorum sensus in-*  
*gressa est divinitus propria. Revera enim*  
*non immerito ab his procul abcesserit Chri-*  
*sti clementia, in quibus manifestè luce clares-*  
*huiusmodi esse, ut eos a caelesti provisione*  
*exorsu cernamus; qua in ipsos tanta ve-*  
*sanità perseverat, cum, incredibili arrogan-*  
*tia persuadeant sibi, quæ nec dici, nec au-*  
*diri fas est, decedentes a recto iudicio dato,*  
*quo caelesti provisione meum iudicium eos*  
*comperi postulare? Quævis malignitatis in*  
*eorum pectoribus perseverat? Quævis a me*  
*jam ipso improbitissimus additionibus suis sunt*  
*condigna responsione oppressi, qui utique si*  
*hoc ante oculos suos habere voluissent, mi-*  
*nime hoc ipsum interposuissent. Meum iu-*  
*dicium postulant, qui ipse iudicium*  
*Christi expecto. Dico enim (ut se veri-*  
*tas habet) Sacerdotum iudicium, ita de-*  
*bet haberi ac si ipse Dominus residentis ju-*  
*dicet. Nihil enim his licet sentire, nec*  
*aliud iudicare, nisi quod Christi Magist-*  
*rio sunt edocli.*

*Ibid. Quod igitur sentiant, maligni*  
*homines, officia Diaboli? Perquirunt Se-*  
*cularia, relinquentes caelestia. O rabida*  
*furoris audacia! Sicut in causis Gentilium*  
*fieri solet, appellationem interposuerunt.*  
*Quid hi detractatores Legis, qui renuentes*  
*caeleste iudicium, meum putaverunt postu-*  
*landum? Sic senserunt de Christo Sal-*  
*vatore? Ecce tam Proditors! Ecce sine*  
*ulla aciore disquisitione ipsi per semet pro-*  
*diderunt facinora sua! Quid ab ipsis sen-*  
*titur humanitas, qui in ipso Deo immanes*  
*profliterunt? Nihilominus vos (Fratres*  
*charissimi) qui Domini Salvatoris se-*  
*quimini viam, patientiam adhibere, data*  
*his adhuc optone, quid putant deligendum,*  
*ac si eos in iisdem videritis perseverare,*  
*protinus cum his, quos Dominus dignos cultu*  
*suo iudicavit, proficiscimini, & redite ad*  
*proprias sedes, meique memnente, ut meo*  
*Salvator noster semper misereatur.*



‘ and whatsoever the Bishops shall fix upon, be sure that you  
 ‘ readily comply with them in it, whom God hath thought fit to  
 ‘ be honour’d by him. And return to your proper Sees, and re-  
 ‘ member me, that our Saviour may always have mercy upon  
 ‘ me.

That which I find prefix’d to the Epistle ought not to be here omitted; because it represents these *Donatists*, who appeal from the legal Sentence of the Bishops for the fixing a Bishop in his District, to be singular therein; and, which is worse, to have made the secular Courts their Presidents. The words are these. *Epistola Imperatoris Constantini; ubi dixit, qui pars Donati, quomodo forenses, sic litigant, ut denuntient & appellent, & Imperatorem desiderant audire post Episcopum judicata.* The Epistle of the Emperor Constantine, where he hath said: those that are of the Party of Donatus, like secular pleaders, do so contend, that they remonstrate and appeal, and desire the Emperor to hear those things, which the Bishops have judg’d before.

And now, since this wise, and most religious Emperor hath thus amply and pathetically declar’d, that the rights of fixing a Bishop in his See are instated on the Bishops by Christ himself; and he brands those that appeal from their judicatures, to the thrones of Princes, i. e. from the heavenly, to the Secular powers, (as he phrases it), asserting a right in the latter to revoke the Church’s investiture and possession, and place a Successor upon it: Since these men (I say) are characterized by him, as men that have sear’d Consciences, and despise the Law of God, and Christ; and that are destitute of his Grace and Clemency, with a great deal more to the same effect, we may neither wonder at, nor censure St. Austin, in that he thus speaks of him, \* But because Constantine durst not judge of the cause of a Bishop, (viz. of Cæcilianus) he assign’d that Office to be discuss’d, and ended by the Bishops; and it was determin’d in the City of Rome by Melchisedech his Bishop, and his Collegues. An Emperor is no more warrant’d to invade and usurp the rights, which Christ hath deriv’d, and solely and immutably fix’d on the Bishops, than the meanest of his Subjects is; but he is subjected to the Church as well as they. And how can it be conceiv’d that so wise, religious, and knowing an Emperor as Constantine hath all along shew’d himself to be, should dare to do such a thing? Or why may not a Bishop say, that he durst not.

But yet, since the *Donatists* were so stubbornly resolv’d in the carrying

\* Sed quia non ausus est Constantinus de causa Episcopi judicare, eam discussiendam atque finiendam Episcopis delegavit, quod & factum est in urbe Roma, presente Melchisedech Episcopo, &c. Ep. 162.





should be continued and confirm'd in the See, who had been first ordain'd ; and that another people, who wanted a Governor, should be assign'd for the other.

And a Decision was made to the same effect, by the same authority, i. e. by the Bishops only, in the Council held at *Arclatum*, which *Constantine* call'd sometime after for that purpose, upon the continu'd complaints, and restless importunities of the *Donatists*, pretending that they had not had a fair hearing in the former Synod ; as it is in the foremention'd Epistle to \* *Chrestus*. The Empire's favor call'd them thither, and order'd *Ablavius*, the then Proconsul of *Africa*, to give every Bishop his *Tractatorie*,† i. e. sufficient provision for his Journey : But tho' *Constantine* was there in his own Person ( it we'll take *Eusebius*'s words for it || ) and sat amidst the Bishops, as a common Bishop constituted of God\*, and did joyn with them in their Episcopal Acts †, assisting them in order to peace ; yet he did not act judicially amongst them ( but in that respect subjected himself as became him ) nor did he perform the part of a real Bishop in that Convention : So that the *Donatists* did afterwards make their appeal from the Council to the Empire ||, since *Constantine* did not act as a Judge in it ; tho' *Natalis Alexander* \* thinks their Appeal to be a sufficient proof, that he was not personally in the Council. I cannot omit taking notice here of one of the Canons † in this Synod, which provides, That the Bishops should exclude from the Church communion those Magistrates which were Christian. *Scilicet Christianam Disciplinam aliquid agerent, if they acted any thing against the Christian Discipline.* It being a strong evidence, that the Secular power did not then over rule in the Government of the Church.

But these turbulent men did not desist ; tho' the Catholick Bishops had, in two Councils, determin'd and declar'd against them ; they being in the number of those, who may be confuted, but cannot be overcome, because their work is always to resist the truth. And as they had before appeal'd from the Council at *Rome* to the Emperor's Person ; they again make another appeal from this Council of *Arclatum* : and tho' *Constantine* did not think that they were less impious and unreasonable in this appeal, than they were in the former ; or that himself was better qualify'd to judge in a Church case than he was before ; yet, upon a full experience that their prejudices to the Church Judges was so great that their Decisions would have

\* Euseb. H. E.  
l. 10. c. 5.

† Ep ad Ablav.  
in fine Optat.  
supra Baron.  
Annal Anno.  
214. Num. 45.  
|| De int. Const.  
l. 1. c. 37.

\* Oia tis xristi-  
nois  
πρὸς τὸν Θεόν  
καὶ τὸν πληθύνον  
† Κρίνοντες τὸν  
ἐκκλησιαστικὸν μέ-  
ρος ἐκείνου.

Ibid.

|| Ibid.  
\* Hist. Eccles.  
secul. 4. pars.  
prim p. 62.  
† Can. 6. Conc.  
1. Arclat.

no effect for peace upon them; and considering withal that the greatest part of *Africa* joyn'd with them, and became very tumultuous, insomuch that his Empire might be embroil'd by them, and its quiet, in those parts of it, hazarded, if they continu'd; especially since they so clamorously pretended, that they would acquiesce in his determination. Hereupon, the most Religious Emperor (tho' unwillingly) \* condescended to their request; but not without regret for his seeming to intermeddle with the Bishops Provinces, and asking them pardon for it. And he first appointed *Rome* for the place of hearing, and gave each party orders to appear there; but *Cacilianus* did not come; and *Constantine* would not proceed against him when absent, as the *Donatists* had done before: So that Assembly prov'd ineffectual, for which *St. Austin* seems much concern'd, wishing that he had then declar'd his judgment, and thereby put an end to their mad animosities, since they had engag'd themselves to submit unto it, and could not go back without a great blemish upon them. But the Emperor appointed another at *Milan*, in which all parties appear'd; and, upon a full hearing, he declar'd, *Cacilianum innocentissimum, illos improbissimos*, as *St. Austin* speaks, *Cacilian* to be innocent, and the *Donatists* most impious. But as his judgment here concurr'd with the two Synods precedeing, so it had no better effect; for they censur'd him upon it as corrupt, partial, and unjust. And tho' he did not here either take upon him the part of a spiritual Judge, or add to, or diminish from the decisions and sanctions of the two precedeing Councils; but concern'd himself so far only, τῶν ἐπισκοπῶν, with the things which the Bishops had done there \* as to satisfy himself in the impartiality and probity of them: Yet he acted as a Secular Judge, and punish't their purses†, took from them the liberty to make a will, seized their meeting Houses, and determin'd to punish them || capitally for their non compliance; but *Hosius* with the other Bishops prevail'd upon him to forgo that severity. And the argument seems to be good, that since these worldly mulcts are thus particularly mention'd, and no other; they are the only judicial Acts which *Constantine* perform'd in this Controversie.

\* *August. Ep.*  
162.

\* *De vita Constant. l. 1. c. 37.*

† *Aug. Ep. 188. l. 2. cont. Petil. c. 92.*

|| *Id l. 1. cont. Parmen. c. 8.*

\* *Vid. Constant. Ep. ad Cacilian. Episc. Carthag. in Euseb H. E. l. 18.*

## S E C T. II.

**A**N D thus, I think, I have abundantly made it to appear, to any, who shall peruse this account, and desire satisfaction; that the right to constitute and remove a Bishop was solely in the Church, during *Constantine's* reign; unless they can produce their *dependencies*, or secret History, in opposition to that, which our best Authors have openly deliver'd of those affairs. And I do heartily wish, that two sorts of men would seriously consider it, and lay aside their frequent discourses, in which they declare themselves of another opinion, and contradict that which is wrote as with a Sun beam, in the eyes of all men that can, and will, see it.

One sort of these men say, *That the Church exercis'd a right, or rather a power, whilst the Empire was Heathen: But it became an Escheat to Constantine, when he became a Christian, and hath since remain'd in his Succession; and now is actually subjected in every Prince that is Christian, of what Line, Age, or Country, soever.*

But how came *Constantine* to be ignorant of this accumulated right upon his becoming a Christian? or, if he knew it, why did he forego it, nay abdicate it, since his conversion deriv'd and warrant'd it unto him? To say nothing of the Emperors that were his Successors, whose case was the same. Or were the Bishops in *Constantine's*, and the succeeding reigns, ignorant of this? Or, which will be a great deal worse, did they know, but conceal it, and usurp upon the Empire, by the exercise of that power, which they knew to belong unto it, and themselves had no right in? This Character will not become these holy Men: But their enemies would have been glad to have met with such men as *Mr. Selden*, *Mr. Hobbs*, and some other novellists, and receiv'd the information from them; for none then among them were able to have given them these new lights. It would have effectually prov'd that charge against them some so much desir'd to make out, and so frequently attempted, but could find no bottom to build it upon, viz. That they acted by principles very prejudicial to the Government.

The other sort of men (which, I hope, may in time be better advis'd) are those that say no less, to the Church's disreputation; viz. *That the Bishops did relinquish their original right to the Empire,*  
and

and wholly quit it, when the Emperors became Christian; even by a kind of Simoniackal compact, being brib'd unto it, by the temporal Possessions and Immunities, with which they vested them.

Now tho' I will not undertake to answer for the integrity of every Bishop, as to this matter, especially in the two Reigns of *Constantius*, and *Valens*; under which, too many will be found to have waver'd, during their persecutions, (tho' a competent number did not) their worldly Interests having over much influence upon them: Yet they had no temptation to do it under *Constantine*, whose principles directed him (and his practice was accordingly, save once, in *Athanasius's* case, in the Council of *Tyre*) to support, and preserve them entire, in those liberties, with which *Christ* had endow'd them; and they would have incurr'd his utmost displeasure, if they had deliver'd up one of them. So that this Plea also is altogether precarious. And surely the case of *Cæcilianus* and *Majorinus* is so full an evidence of the Church's immutable Right, exclusive to the State, and the inviolated preservation of it, that nothing can be more so. For 1. *Cæcilianus* was enthron'd at *Carthage* by the neighbouring Bishops, and by their hands only, upon the voydance of that Chair, by the death of *Mensurius*: And this *Constantine* himself has own'd to have been done according to *Christ's* Institution. \* And farther when *Donatus*, and his Party, oppos'd *Cæcilianus* in bringing *Majorinus* upon him, he tells them  
*That they did thereby so far wickedly and perversely desert the Holy Religion, the Heavenly Power, and the Catholick Determination.* †  
 As in his Epistle to *Crestus* Bishop of *Syracuse*, above mention'd; with a great deal more to the same effect; which I have already recited.

2. That the Bishops, and they alone, were the Judges, and had a right to determine, judicially, upon any doubt that seemingly, or really, might arise concerning *Cæcilianus's* Title, to confirm it, or voyd it, and place a Successor upon him: And *Constantine* admonisheth, censureth, and condemns the *Donatists* for asserting the same right in himself, and supplicating him to execute it; for which he represents them as men that are bardned, destitute of the *Sunshine-light* of the Gospel, and of the *Divine Clemency*, and haters of the *Provision* which *Christ* hath made for that purpose by his Church. Of which, and more, I have also given an account above.

3. *Constantine* removes this right and power quite from himself,

\* Ep. ad Episc.  
 Catholicos supra  
 † θαυλας, ἐν-  
 διασεως τι-  
 ρες πρεσβυ-  
 τερους της  
 θρησκειας  
 της αιχλης  
 † εν τω παρει-  
 δοντατος  
 2) τος επιβρα-  
 ως καδοχμης  
 αποδινειν εαν  
 επ' αωλο, Εγκλ.  
 H. E. l. 10. c. 5.



self, and disowns it, as that which no ways belongs to him. It seems then that the Coördinate Power of the Church and State in the exercise of it, which Doctor *Hody* speaks of, was unknown to this great Emperor, when he says *That the Civil \* and Ecclesiastical Persons are Governors alike; and the latter exceeds the former only in that those have a superadded right to administer the Sacraments and ordain the Clergy: And if the Emperor had thought fit to have exercised his right in the Ecclesiastical Government, and depos'd Cornelius; St. Cyprian would have own'd, and submitted to his deprivation † as reasonable and just. And tho' I can't answer his demand ‖ and make it appear That the Church hath ever refus'd to submit to the present Possessor, because his Predecessor was unjustly depos'd by the secular Power; we have prov'd the secular Power incompetent to deprive him: and if he does prove that St Cyprian, or any one, or more Bishops, have submitted, ( tho' I'll engage he cannot prove it upon St. Cyprian ) their examples will not be argumentative: and he had as good let it alone.*

4. All that *Constantine* did, or was capable to do, in this matter of *Cæcilianus*, and *Majorinus*, in the way of Judicature, was to confirm the antecedent judicial Acts of the Bishops, and corroborate them, by his secular Laws and Penalties.

5. And lastly. It is here also to be consider'd, that this Power, of which we have been discoursing, thus exercis'd by the Bishops, and disclaim'd by *Constantine* himself, related purely and solely to the fixing a Bishop in his See. *i. e.* To that one particular branch of the rights and power of the Priesthood, by which one Bishop is enabled to give possession to another; and the Bishop so possess'd receives a right to govern the Officers subjected to him, and the Believers within his own District, and they become oblig'd to pay their duty of subjection to him. The Empire could then no more do it ( at least in its own apprehensions ) then it could administer the Sacraments, or give holy Orders. 'Tis true the right of Investiture is so far in the Prince, as it extends to the Bishop's Temporals, and no other hand but his can legally possess a Bishop of them, and give him a civil forinseck right unto them: But as it extends to his Spirituals, the Prince can no more invest him with them, than he can give him the *Holy Ghost*, or a Power to dispense any other of *Christ's* Institutions. And we are most sure, that the Catholicks did not refuse to communicate with *Majorinus* because he was an Heretick.

Heretick, (tho' Doctor *Hody* often contends they did refuse Communion with several Schismatical Bishops brought in upon a full See, as *Majorinus* was, not because of their Schism, or want of a Title, but because of their heresie) since no one pretends that the *Donatists* were any ways Heretical; at least when this Controversie of Church Right was started by them: \* *Heresis autem* Tho' St *Austin* \* afterwards calls them Hereticks, by reason of their continu'd, obstinate, and invincible Schism; as also in that they maintain'd several Errors, concerning the nature of the Catholick Church, as rebaptizations, &c. which they did not broach till that cause was ended.

*Schisma inventum post causam dictam & finitam, — in Haresin Schisma verterunt. l. 2. contra Cresc. Gram. c. 7. de Haresibus c. 69.*

## S E C T I I I.

**I** Cannot omit one instance more in *Constantine's* days: It is that of his proceedings against *Athanasius*; which great Prelate, we know, fell so far under his displeasure, thro' the malice and craft of his restless Adversaries, (especially the *Eusebians*, who had gain'd too much upon the good Emperor, and thereby lay'd their design to restore *Arianism*, but did not effect it till the latter end of *Constantine's* Reign,) that *Constantine* gave way to that great Prelate's deposition, for several crimes exhibited, but never prov'd against him. Now, did *Constantine* effect it, or but pretend to do it, by his own Right or Power? Or did the Treacherous *Eusebian* Bishops and Clergy advise him so to do by his own Authority? Or did they divest themselves of their own Rights therein, tho' they afterwards shamelessly prostituted the Privileges of the Church to *Constantine* in the like cases of *Liberius*, and other Bishops? Was not a Council call'd at *Tyre* by *Constantine* † on purpose to remove him? Or did any hands there except those of the Bishops, make and execute the deposing Sentence? Or what more did the Empire do in that whole affair, but second the Synod's Decree, by exiling him into *Trevers* in *France*? And this was in the 30th. year of *Constantine's* Reign, and but two years before his death: From whence it is very evident, that he continued in the opinion he had entertain'd in the case of *Majorinus*, which was 22. years before. And during these 30 years of his Reign he was not sensible of any such Church Rights, which some, so very confidently maintain to have accrew'd to his Crown upon his becoming Christian. We may with the same security vouch for

† *Socrat. l. 1. c. 21, 22, 23. Theod. l. 1. c. 30, 31. Six. l. 2. c. 24.*

his two following years; and that the Bishops did not themselves relinquish any such rights, or derive them unto him, being brib'd to it by his temporal Favours. And this will be rendred much more probable, it will be demonstrated, if we consider the nature of this Synod, and some circumstances of it, as we find them in *Athanasius* \* By what right then (says he) could they convene a Synod against us? Or, with what impudence call that a Council, where the secular Governor, or Prefect, is President, his Guards keep the door, and instead of the Deacons of the Church, his Notary, or Register, introduceth the members: He speaks, the other keeping silence, or rather, paying their obedience to him: Inasmuch that the Bishops had not freedom of speech by reason of him: he gave the command; we were conducted by the Soldiery; or rather the Prefect himself did only attend the Sentences of the Eusebians? In short (my belov'd Brethren) what face is there of a Synod, where banishment, or slaughter were determin'd, if the Emperor's pleasure had no effect. *Athanasius*†

† Ὅμοια συνδεδεμένους  
λαί, καὶ τὸ ἔργον αὐτοῦ παρὰ  
Βασιλέως λαμβάνουσι: καὶ  
καὶ ἐπὶ τῷ καὶ ἐξουσίᾳ  
τοῦ προέδρου, τῶν ἐπισκόπων  
καὶ Βασιλέως ἐξουσία συνελ-  
θόντες ἐκείνους, ἀναγκάζον-  
ται. Ibid. p. 730.

adds in another place, They pretend the name of Synod, when the work of it is manag'd by the King: And for this end, the secular Governor and the Soldiers do overawe the Bishops with their Guards; and the King's Letters call the Meeting, compelling those whom they require to come in.

From whence these following observables are easy and manifest.

1. That *Constantine* cannot be conceiv'd to have chang'd his Opinion in his latter days, and maintain a direct and immediate right in himself to abdicate a Bishop, and absolve his Subjects of their duty to him, since he not only call'd this Council of *Tyre* on purpose for *Athanasius*'s abdication, (which makes a strong presumption that he did not think his own Power to be competent for it) but in that he acted mediately only, and indirectly, by the Bishops hands: And either provided that the Synod should be made up of his own Creatures; or else he employ'd his Prefect, and inferior secular Officers to overawe, and over rule their votes, menacing terrors and penalties against them, when they did not answer his design. For what needed he to have proceeded in this manner, if his single Edict had been a Law to the Church, as it was to the State? Can any account be given of these his Artifices, mean compliances, and his servile dependence on the *Eusebian* Bishops? Or of the meaning of his threats to the *Orthodox*, if he could of himself, have effectually depos'd *Athanasius*,

or the Bishops had not had a right, and power to obstruct his Deposition, separate, and independent upon the Emperour.

2. If it be said here, ( as it usually is upon other occasions ) that *Constantine* did not understand his own Rights in the Church ; or else that he gave them up to her discretion, being guided by an over ruling zeal, or, as some may say, by a particular interest. The first cannot be pleaded ; since it is not likely that his whole Court knew no better, or that it did not inform him : or that it would at the same time preclude the Empire's right and truckle under those that usurpt it ; especially under the Bishops, whose Lordship it could least endure. And for the latter, he was so far from giving all up to the Church's discretion, that he gain'd a Majority in the Council by menaces and violence. The *Eusebian* Bishops only were they that acted freely, and their votes were implicitly receiv'd and submitted to, thro' the present distress of those who complied with them. And by these means the cause was gain'd against *Athanasius*.

3. It is hence very plain, that *Constantine's* Doctrine and Practice, in the case of *Cæcilianus*, and *Majorinus* ( of which an account is given above ) was purely upon Church principles ; since *Athanasius* does contend here, and declare for the same ; and we are to think that the other Catholick Bishops, which were in the Synod, and adhered to him, nay protested against the *Eusebians* proceedings, amongst whom the famous *Paphnutius* was one, did not come behind him in it. What less doth our most Holy *Alexandrian* Patriarch say, than that the secular Power is not to intermeddle with the deposing of a Bishop, either by the Emperour in Person, or by his Substitutes, but that it is the work of the Bishops alone.

Besides, since *Athanasius* \* appeal'd from this Pseudo-Synod to *Constantine* ; we may not think that his protestation against his right to depose, was, even in *Constantine's* opinion, in injury to him ; if it had been thought so by him, we cannot believe that he would have shew'd so much kindness to him as he did afterwards. *Constantine* the Son tells us, that his Father design'd to retal *Athanasius*, but he was prevented by his death ; and that he did not banish him to *Trevers* as a guilty man, but to preserve him from the Rabble in *Egypt* ; and farther, that it was upon his own experience in *France* ( where *Constantine* the Son's Government lay ) of *Athanasius's* eminent virtues, that he accomplish'd his Father's design, and sent him back in

\* *Theod. H. E.*  
l. 1. c. 31.  
Soc. l. 2. c. 22.



peace to *Alexandria* ; an account of which we have in his Epistle to the People of that City ; where, he says that his Father purpos'd to call him home, *ἰδὼ τόπον*, as to his proper place, and as an unduly dispossest'd Prelate. But do Emperors use to bestow such *Eulogies* and Graces on those, who take the chief Jewels out of their Crowns, and teach others that they ought to do the same? For such we are told, by some, their deposing Power is.

I thought to have concluded this Chapter here ; but I cannot forbear, upon further considerations, to desire the Reader to compare the following Account of St. *Cyprian* and *Constantine* ; in which he will find them to have had the same sentiments concerning the Rights of the Church, as to our present Case, tho' they liv'd, at least, sixty years asunder ; St. *Cyprian*, when *Novatianus* and *Fortunatus* were brought into his and *Cornelius's* Sees, whilst they were alive, and possess'd them upon Church terms : *Constantine*, when *Majorinus* was brought into *Cæcilianus's* See, *Cæcilianus* being the rightful Possessor of it, and the *Donatists* supplicated him to undertake their cause : And both of them are *positive*, that none but a Church Right can fix a Bishop in a District, or deprive him : Even a Church Right cannot bring a Bishop into a See that is then legally fill'd : But if the Prince, or any other Power that is worldly, does fix or deprive a Bishop, and a People does receive and obey him, or reject and disobey him, upon that Authority, they herein act in opposition to God and Christ, and the Church ; whose Laws have provided otherwise.

St. *Cyprian* declares, upon the foremention'd occasion, to this effect, *viz.*

L. 1. Ep. 3. Ed. vet. That he who brings in a Bishop upon another, than duly placed in a See, acts against the Divine Law, and makes himself a Judge, not of the Bishop, but of God.

*Ibid.*

That the Second which is brought in, is not a Bishop according to the will of God, but contrary to the disposition and tradition of the Gospel : such a Bishop is made without God and his Holy-Spirit.

*Quod Sacerdoti Dei non obtemperatur nec unus in Ecclesia ad tempus iudex, nec ad tempus Sacerdos. — si secundum Magisteria Divina, — post divinum Iudicium — iudicem se non tam Episcopi quam Dei.*

*Plane Episcopi non de voluntate Dei fiunt, sed contra dispositionem & traditionem Evangelii, — si bimet ipsi Regem constituerunt, & non per me : habuisti consilium & non per me ; & fecisti conventionem & non per Spiritum meum.*

That



‘ That when desperate men,  
made for destruction, do im-  
pugn a rightful Bishop, it is not  
‘ from Christ, who constitutes  
‘ and protects Bishops ; but from  
‘ him who is the Adversary of  
‘ Christ, and enemy of the  
‘ Church, the Devil.

‘ *Cornelius* succeeded *Fabianus*  
‘ in a lawful Ordination, and  
‘ *Novatianus* assumes his Chair ;  
‘ he does it in contempt of the  
‘ Evangelical and Apostolical  
‘ Tradition : — he is a For-  
‘ eigner, and profane.

‘ As there is one God, one  
‘ Christ, one Church ; so there  
‘ is one Bishop : a new Priesthood  
‘ cannot be made, besides that  
‘ one which is constituted : If  
‘ so, it is adulterous, it is impious  
‘ and sacrilegious ; it is institut-  
‘ ed by the fury of man, that  
‘ the Divine Institution should  
‘ be violated.

‘ To bring in one Bishop upon  
‘ another is contrary to the Ec-  
‘ clesiastical Disposition, the E-  
‘ vangelical Law, the Unity of  
‘ the Catholick Institution.

‘ One Bishop is placed in a  
‘ District instead of Christ:

‘ By the Sentence of God.

‘ By the Sentence of God  
‘ and Christ.

‘ By Divine Inspiration.

‘ By the Omnipotent God,  
‘ and Christ the Lord.

‘ By the Will of God.

‘ This Unity was deliver’d  
‘ from the Lord by the Apo-

*Cum talis frater a quibusdam  
desperatis & perditis impugnari Ep. 9. l. 4.  
videtur, non Christus, qui Sacerdo-  
tes aut constituit, aut protegit ;  
sed ille qui Christi Adversarius,  
& Ecclesie inimicus. Ibid. — Dia-  
bolo crederent Episcopum proscri-  
benti.*

*Qui Fabiano legitima Ordina- Ep. 6. l. 4.  
tione successit — Evangelica  
& Apostolica Traditione contem-  
pta — alienus est, profanus  
est.*

*Deus unus est, Christus unus est, Ep. 8. ibid.  
& Ecclesia una est. — novum  
fieri præter unum Sacerdotium non  
potest : — Adulterum est,  
impium & sacrilegum est : —  
Humano furore instituitur, ut di-  
positio Divina violetur.*

*Contra Ecclesiasticam dispositio- Ep. 2. l. 3.  
nem, contra Evangelicam Legem,  
contra Institutionis Catholice Uni-  
tatem.*

*Unus in Ecclesia Sacerdos L. 1. Ep. 3.  
vice-Christi.*

*Judicio Dei.*

*Lib. 3. Ep. 13*

*Dei & Christi ejus Senten- Ibid.  
tia.*

*Ad hunc locum Divinitus electi. Ibid.*

*A Deo Omnipotente, Christoque Ep. 2. ibid.  
Domino.*

*De Dei voluntate*

*Lib. 4. Ep. 2.*

*A Domino per Apostolos nobis Lib. 2. Ep. 8.  
Successoribus.*

'files, 'to the Bishops their Successors.

L. 2. Ep. 11.

L. 4. Ep. 2.

'This one Bishop is placed  
'and confirmed in his See by  
'the Testimony of his Collegues,  
'and the Suffrage of the Clergy.

Ep. 6. l. 1. Ep.

11. l. 2. Ep. 2.

l. 3.

'He cannot be accounted  
'a Pastor, nor hold a District,  
'who is Ordain'd by his own  
'private Rule, upon a lawful  
'Succession. Neither the se-  
'cular Magistrate, nor any ir-  
'resistible Party can constitute  
'such a Bishop. Such a thing is  
'neither permitted by the Law  
'of God, nor lawful to be done.

Ep. 8. l. 4.

'Whosoever he is that is  
'placed in a Bishoprick, and  
'accepts it with the breach of  
'the Laws of the Church, is to  
'be reputed as no Bishop.

Ep. 3. l. 1. Ep. 6.

Ibid.

'He is made a Bishop, but  
'not according to the Will of  
'God : He cannot be account-  
'ed a Bishop. He is a Stranger  
'and without.

Ensch. H. Eccl.

l. 6. c. 35.

(Cornelius of Rome says of  
'Novatianus also, that he did  
'not receive his Bishoprick  
'from God.)

L. 2. Ep. 10.

l. 3. Ep. 14.

'He is an Adulterous and  
'contrary head. He hath an  
'adulterous Chair.

L. 4. Ep. 2.

'Tho' he boast much of him-  
'self, and challenges a great  
'deal, he is no Bishop.

Constantine the Emperor declares also to the same effect in  
his Epistle to the Catholick Bishops, upon the forementioned  
occasions, as,

'That the Donatists do not

*Episcopo facto Collegarum Te-  
stimonio ; Cleri suffragio Ordinato.  
— Factus Episcopus a plurimis Col-  
legis nostris. — De Sacerdotum Col-  
legio. — Omnium nostrorum con-  
sensione firmato.*

*Pastor haberi quomodo potest,  
qui manente vero Pastore nemini  
succedens, a seipso Ordinatus est ?  
—— Nullo modo tenere Ec-  
clesiam potest. —— Constituti  
nullo modo posse : —— Nec fas  
est, nec fieri licet.*

*Quisquis ille fuerit ; &c.*

*Planè Episcopi non de volun-  
tate Dei fiunt. —— Nec Epis-  
copus computari potest. Est alie-  
nus, foris.*

( Τὴν μὴ δοθεῖσαν αὐτῷ ἀνά-  
δεν ἑκαταρχὴν ἐπιχειρεῖ. )

*Adulterum & contrarium caput :  
—— adulteram Cathedram.*

*Multum licet de se jactans, &  
plurimum vendicans, nullus est.*

*Si vera fide voluerint obse-  
receive*

‘ receive the Scriptures with a  
‘ right Faith.

‘ A propitious Divine Influ-  
‘ ence hath not reacht them.

‘ The Clemency of Christ is  
‘ gone far from them.

‘ They hate the provision  
‘ which is made for their better  
‘ information.

‘ Great madness abides  
‘ them.

‘ A forcible malignity is lodg’d  
‘ in their breasts.

‘ Otherwise they would have  
‘ understood that God had pro-  
‘ vided in his Law, that the  
‘ Church alone should be Judg  
‘ in the case of fixing Bishops  
‘ in their Sees : It being as clear  
‘ as the Sun at Noon day : The  
‘ contrary is not to be spoken  
‘ nor heard : Neither would  
‘ they have requir’d my Judg-  
‘ ment, since a Heavenly pro-  
‘ vision is made for them other-  
‘ waies by the Church.

‘ If a prevailing malignity  
‘ had not aboad in their breast ;  
‘ and they had not willfully  
‘ forgotten the Law, oft have  
‘ they been inform’d and warned  
‘ by my self against these their  
‘ wicked practices, they would  
‘ not have interpos’d and sup-  
‘ plicated me in this matter.

‘ They ask judgment of me,  
‘ in this affair, who am to be  
‘ judg’d by the Church : I speak  
‘ as the truth is, the judgment  
‘ of the Priests ought to be ac-  
‘ counted the same as God’s

*quia Sanctissimæ Legi deferre.*

*Neque in eorum sensus ingressa  
est propitia Divinitas.*

*Ab his procul abcesserat Christi  
clementia.*

*Eos a Cælesti provisione exosos.*

*Quæ in ipsos tanta vesania per-  
severat.*

*Quæ vis malignitatis in eorum  
pectioribus perseverat.*

*Intelligere poterunt quantum  
sibi nutu Dei provisum sit. — in  
quibus manifesta luce claret : —  
in iis quibus maxima durities in-  
genita est possit reprehendi : — Cæ-  
lesti provisione meum iudicium eos  
comperi postulare.*

*Quæ vis malignitatis in eorum  
pectioribus perseverat ? — Quo-  
ties improbißimis additionibus suis  
sunt condigna responsione oppressi ?  
— si hoc ante oculos suos ba-  
bere voluissent, minime hoc ipsum  
interposuissent.*

*Meum iudicium postulant, qui  
ipse iudicium Christi expecto. —  
— dico enim, ut se veritas ha-  
bet Sacerdotum iudicium ita debet  
haberi, ac si ipse Deus residens  
iudicat.*

*judgment,*

judgment, given in his Person from the Bench.

These men in refusing the Heavenly Judgment (meaning the Churches, by which *Cæcilianus* was plac'd in the *Carthaginian* See) and thinking it fit that my Judgment should be ask'd, and my Power be imply'd in the continuing him there, or removing him from it, they therein——

Do the Offices of the Devil.

As the part of the Gentils,

Make their savage insults upon God himself.

He exhorts the Catholick Bishops to go home to their District, and receive those Bishops, whom the Lord, by his Church, has placed in their several Sees : and to pray for him.

Now, upon a just consideration of this state, and these rights of the Church and the Empire, with respect to the filling and vacating Sees, or accepting and rejecting Bishops, in the time of our Eminent Archbishop St. *Cyprian*, and *Constantine* the Great, and first Christian Emperor, as themselves have given us an account of them; and a due comparing their Judgments and Determinations concerning them, as they are above set down, from their own pens; it will appear very plain and evident, to a demonstration, That those Rights, and that Power, which the Christian Bishops, in the *Cyprianick* Age exercis'd to the foremention'd purpose under *Rome Heathen*, remain'd in the Bishops, and only in them; and were exercis'd by them, under *Rome Christian*, in the days of *Constantine* : They then became neither an elcheat to the Empire, nor were delivered into its hands, by the Bishops, upon its becoming Christian : but, as the practice of the Church and of the Empire, so the Laws of both continu'd their execution, as subject'd before in the Church : Even the immediate and eternal Law of *Christ Jesus* provided for it. And that in their Judgements, none but senseless and stupid men, as to the things,

*Renuentes Cælestæ judicium,  
meum putaverunt postulandum.*

*Officia Diaboli.*

*Sicut in causis Gentilium fieri solet.  
Qui in ipso Deo immaniores profu-*  
*lierunt.*

*Cum his quos Dominus dignos  
cultu suo judicavit proficiscimini,  
& redite ad proprias sedes, meique  
mementote, ut mei Salvator mi-*  
*seretur.*

things of God, being under the Devil's instigation, could think and believe otherwise. As the Church is concluded by St. Cyprian to have a Divine indefeasible right, not only to lay hands upon and Consecrate them; but to Ordain, (as he useth the word)\* i. e. to invest the Bishops in their Sees; So she is suppos'd and allow'd by Constantine to retain the same, and she alone: He does not pretend to it. Doth he not quite remove it from him?

\* Apud Cornelium qui Episcopo Fabiano legitima Ordinatione successit.

l. 1. Ep. 6.—  
—Episcopo Cornelio Cleri & plebis Suffragio ordinato. l. 3.

Ep. 13.—Nec habeat Ecclesia ordinationem.  
l. 4. Ep. 2.

### CHAP. III. SECT. I.

IF we look into the State of the Empire and the Church in Constantius's Reign, ( who was Son to Constantine the Great, and his immediate Successor ) we shall find them to be the same as in Constantine's: Tho' we may meet with some different practices, which the Eusebians put him upon, ( deserting the true Government, and the true Faith, at once ) but were still protested against by a competent number of Catholic Bishops and Believers: And we have good reason to think that Constantius was well aware of his error therein; and that he was wheedled into it by his Eusebians, who were dexterous in that Art, and would boggle at nothing to serve a present turn; since few Princes have been known more constantly to apply themselves to their Clergy, and to make use of them more than he did; insomuch that the Heathen Historian †, not only takes notice of it, but he does it in a lessening way, representing the Bishops, as *running hither and thither in Troops by Synods, as they call them.* And, I remember, he somewhere, thereabout, ridicules them, and says, *That Constantius plough'd up his roads with the frequent going of Coaches, which carried them from place to place.*

† Ut cateris antistitum juvenis publicis ultro citroque discurrantibus per Synodos, quas appellant. Ammian. Marcell. l. 21. in fine Libri.

For the proof of this, and that Constantius did not really believe that he was vested with a Right to exercise the deposing power on a Bishop, and by removing him from his Bishoprick to make way for a Successor; tho' his passion and Interest did now and then push him on to make some attempts that way: I will proceed on the Instance of Athanasius, omitting others at present. Now it is well known that Constantius had a peculiar disgust against this holy Man, insomuch that he peremptorily



torily resolv'd that he should be dispossess'd, and finally remov'd; tho' he condescended some time before, by the Intercession of his Brother *Constantine*, that he should be releas'd from that exile in *France*, which his Father had lay'd him under, and return to his Church and People of *Alexandria*: But did he profess and endeavour to effect his removal afterwards as by a Right, connate, and coeval to his Empire, and vested in a *Decius* or a *Dioclesian*, as Doctor *Hody* would have us believe? Or as elcheated from the Church to him upon his receiving Christianity, as Mr. *Selden* would have it? Or by the submission and resignation of the Bishops then in being, as others suggest? Did he attempt it by any other hands than those of the Bishops? Even when he us'd his own upon other occasions, was it any other waies, *then by offering violence to the hands of the Bishops*, and haling them in, that they might lift them up in voting on his side, as his Father had done before him in the Council of *Tyre*? It must be own'd that he did not alwaies make use of a fair dealing Council, whose Acts were bottom'd on true Church principles: He, indeed, waved every one, which he suspected to be such, as much as he could. Hence, *Athanasius* \* tells us, that the *Eusebians* refus'd to come to the Roman Synod, to which *Julius* summon'd them, because, *there was no Prefect to be present, no Soldiers to keep the Guard, and all was not to be done by the prescript of Cæsar, by which means, and no other, they had conquer'd the Bishops, who might not speak, but under this Presidency, and with their leave.* Yet, he did not hitherto pretend to a separate independent Power in Church affairs, or the deposing Power in particular: nor afterwards, till the perfidious *Eusebians*, *Sycophant Courtiers*, and debauch'd Eunuchs, joyning altogether, had influenc'd him for the worse; and made him, even their Creature: which occasion'd St. *Athanasius* to use these expressions † *The Eunuchs can do all things with Constantius; nothing is done by him without them; they exercise domination over the Church, to, whom the government of Houses is rarely committed.* And Gregory Nazianzen || complaining of the same times, particularly laments them, in that *so much power was given to those who are to be accounted in the number neither of men nor women.* Accordingly, his first proceeding against *Athanasius* was in the Synod of *Antioch*, which was held in the first year of his Reign, for the dedication of a Church, which this Emperor's Father began in that City, and he finish'd: Where his cause was re-examin'd, and

\* *Ubi nec comes affuturus esset, nec satellites pro foribus excubarent, nec ex Cæsaris præscriptis omnia fierent, quibus rationibus, & non aliis, Episcopus vice-runt, imo qui sine hoc præsidio ne huius poterant Ep. ad Solitar. p. 816.*

† *Ib. p. 835.*

|| *Orat. in laude Hieronis.*

and condemn'd, and his former Sentence in the Synod of Tyre confirmed, and reviv'd : In the obtaining of which he made use of his Courtiers, \* and their power ; and it was un-Synodically done, (for the Eusebian Bishops were at first the lesser part of the Council -) but the Bishops alone, made the Decree, and pass'd the Judiciary Sentence upon him ; notwithstanding that *Constantius* was there in his Person. And which is more ; the same Synod which remov'd *Athanasius* made *Gregorius* Bishop of *Alexandria* in his room : And we hence gain our other point, viz. That as the Rights of the Empire were not conceiv'd to enable the Emperor for the removal of a Bishop, once fixed in his See by the proper and rightful hands ; so they were not conceiv'd to be competent for the enthroning and justly possessing a Bishop in a See, tho' Synodically made void. And as *Constantius* did not dare to do the one ; ( for why may I not use the expression concerning him, since St. *Austin* us'd it of his Father in the same case ) so nor the other, in his own right, as Emperor.

I shall not here undertake to determine how far the deposing a Bishop by an Heretical Synod does oblige ; or by an Orthodox one, if it proceed upon false suggestions, publicly known to be such, and to be maliciously prosecuted : neither doth our present enquiry expect it of me. It suffices us at present that *Constantius* did once think fit to make use of Bishops, for the deposing *Athanasius* ; and did it not then by his own secular Arm : Hence I thus argue. That we cannot, upon common thoughts, apprehend, since as *Constantine* his Father had done before him in the Council of Tyre ; so *Constantius* the son would not have proceeded against *Athanasius*, and remov'd him in this Council by the Bishops, if he could have effectually done it by his own Power and Authority, separate from 'em, and independent upon them ; if he had not been assur'd, as his Father was, that his secular, worldly Arm was incompetent for it ; or if he could have satisfied himself, that he had had but a coordinate power with them in order to it. The Argument is much stronger on *Constantius's* side, since his displeasure towards *Athanasius* was much greater than *Constantine's* : It was to excels, because of his insuperable adherence to the *Nicene* Faith ; and became so publick that the Heathen Historian † takes notice of it, and reports it to the world in these words : *Athanasio semper infensus*. Is it any ways credible that he should seek, nay catch

\* *Socr. l. 2. c. 3.*  
*Socr. l. 3. c. 5.*

† *Ammian.*  
*Marcell. l. 15.*

at the advantage of a Synod, as he did of this; put the issue of so desir'd a cause, and the conquest of so considerable a Person, to its hazard; may use tricks in it, which he would have been asham'd of at another time; and employ his Courtiers to bring the Bishops, by threats and violence, to his side, when himself, (as some would have it) was at the same time, the supream Judge of the cause, and could singly, and alone, effectually and irreversibly have determin'd and decided it? His parasite Courtiers upon whose provocation he so much the more desir'd it, could not be ignorant of such a right, if he could have pretended to it. And they would have so order'd it, that no hands but his own should have executed it: But by no means can it be conceiv'd that the Emperor wou'd have been beholden to the Bishops for the doing of it: Especially since the charge of High treason lay against *Athanasius*: In which case Doctor *Hody*\* tells us, *That if Cornelius had been depos'd by Decius, we have all the reason in the world to believe, that his deprivation would have been lookt upon by St. Cyprian as very reasonable and just*, and that that great Archbishop would have submitted to it: Though neither *Constantius* nor *Constantine* were aware that they had any such power: Nor would *Athanasius* have submitted to it, if they executed it upon him. And surely, the Sun is not clearer at high noon, then that these two Emperors supremacies were not conceiv'd to instruct and enable them for it: Or, which is more, that the then Christian World did not believe it self oblig'd to comply with them, if they had usurped it.

It was not very long after the Council of *Amioch*, that the Council of *Sardica* wholly clear'd and acquitted *Athanasius*: And † *Gregorius* dying within some few years, he was partly, by the intercession, and partly, by the threats of *Constans* (who plainly told him that he would otherwise make War against him) call'd home by *Constantius*, and receiv'd by him, and the Church, with great joy; but into the City of *Alexandria* in triumph: And coming in his way to *Jerusalem*, *Maximus*, who was Bishop there, called a Synod, at which all the Bishops of *Palestine*, who had subscrib'd to his banishment, except two confessed their fault in doing of it, and that they were forced to it, and upon their satisfaction, and desire, he receiv'd them into Communion with him. But alas! all this was like the morning dew, which vanishes away: For ‖ *Constans* died soon after, and *Magnentius* rebell'd, and this gave fresh occasion, and

new

\* *Philo.* 10.† *Socrat.* l. 2. c.

11. 14. 18.

*Theod.* l. 2. c. 5.

11, 12.

*Soc.* l. 3, c. 19.‖ *Athanas.* *Apol.*

p. 8. 25.

*Socrat.* l. 2. c. 19.

20, 21.

*Theod.* l. 2. c.

12, 13.

new courage, to that black combination of the *Eusebians*, *Eunuchs*, and Courtiers, to rally upon *Athanasius*; who accus'd him to *Constantius* for making enmity betwixt him and his Brother *Constantus*, and siding with the Tyrant *Magnentius*; they pursu'd their malice home, reinforcing the old, and bringing new informations against him; and a greater persecution than the former, was rais'd upon the Catholics: *Constantius* being prepar'd for it by an excess of pride and haughtiness, when the World so vastly enlarg'd his Empire, and he had subdued *Magnentius*; so that the *Homousian* Bishops were banisht, and *Athanasius* condemn'd to die, but he † miraculously escaped: Yet that did not serve their turn, unless his spiritual deprivation, which had been denounc'd at *Tyre*, was confirm'd, and a divorce be made for ever betwixt him, and his Church and People of *Alexandria*. Now, I do here again demand of our Adversaries: Did *Constantius* attempt to do this by his own power as Emperor, or was he at this time, aware of that Supremacy, which Doctor *Hody* invests him, and his Predecessors, even *Diocletian*, withal, enabling him to dissolve the relation betwixt a Bishop and his Flock, and make way for a Successor to be brought in upon him? His two Brothers were now dead, and he was a kind of Universal Monarch; his enemies were under his feet; || *Ammianus Marcellinus* says, that he was hereupon, || *Ibid. supra.* so highly exalted in the opinion of his own Power, that, in dictating to others what he would have them to write, he sometimes whisper'd, My Eternity: And when he wrote *Eternitatem meam aliquoties* with his own hand, he would name himself the Lord of *scribenderet ipse distando: scribendoque propria manu, orbis* the whole Earth: But it seems he was not sensible *totius se Dominum appellaret.* that his Sovereign Coercive Power did instruct him to remove a Bishop, or to place one in a full See; but wanted a Doctor *Hody* to inform him of that Imperial Right; who attain'd beyond his *Eusebians* in that point, tho' they are known to be pretty good Artists: And knowing no other power but the Church's, whereby he might effectually take *Athanasius* from his See, for that end he call'd another Synod at \* *Millane* in Italy, of the Eastern and \* *Socras. l. 2. c. 29. a Theod. H. E. l. 20. c. 15. Ser. l. 4. c. 8.* Western Bishops; not to make a new Proscription against *Athanasius*; but they being there convened, that he might (using his old Methods) force them to assent to the abdication which was made by those unjust Judges, against certain Bishops in the Council of *Tyre*; amongst whom *Athanasius* was one; who

would thereby be effectually cast out of the Church, and he gain the advantage of the Authority and Corroboration of the *Western* Bishops, for what had been done in that Synod against that great *Alexandrian* Prelate; but especially the Authority of the Bishop of Rome; whose absence from that and the *Antiochian* Synod, ( in which last the *Tyrian* proceedings were confirm'd ) was pleaded by some, for the invalidating the force of them both.

\* L. 14. p. 75.  
76. Ed. Lugdun.  
in 12mo.

\* *Ammianus Marcellinus* gives a very good account of *Constantius's* calling that Synod, ( tho' he represents *Athanasius* as a Conjuror at the same time : For which he is so much the more

† *Nemo (bri-  
gianorum Pres-  
byter non Ma-  
thematicus non  
aurspej in  
Favii vopifici  
Saturnino,*

excusable, since *Hadrianus* the Emperor, † characterizeth every Bishop in *Egypt* as such) but that account is to this effect: That *Athanasius* being deposed by a Synod, and *Constantius* requiring *Liberius* Bishop of Rome, to subscribe unto it, but he refusing; Id enim ille, *Athanasio* infensus, licet sciret impletum, tamen Autoritate qua potiuntur eternæ urbis Episcopi, firmari desiderio nitebatur ardenti. Tho' he knew his Deposition was complete, being made by two Councils, one of Tyre, and the other of Antioch, yet he very much desir'd to have it confirm'd by the Bishop of Rome : In order to which, he call'd all the Western Bishops together at Millane, by which means he expected to have the advantage of prevailing, through his Power and menaces, managed by his Courtiers and Eusebians over *Liberius*, together with the rest; and obtain their assent. And this is a full vindication of *Constantius's* sence of the necessity of a Church Power for the effecting *Athanasius's* deposition; and of his own incompetency to have done without it.

I know the *Romanist* Doctors say; that he so solicitously requir'd *Liberius's* consent, because neither the Synod of Millane, nor those of Tyre and Antioch, nor twenty more, were, or would be valid, without the concurrence of the Bishop of Rome : And they hence assert his Universal Pastourship, as a thing so well known, that the Heathens were not ignorant of it : And *Valesius* doth it, in particular, in his || *Annotations* upon this following Passage of Pope *Julius*; in which he contends, that they ought to have called him to the Council of Antioch, since the Church Canon forbids any Decree to be made without the Bishop of Rome. But, if they have any bottom from this Canon for that assertion, it seems very apparent that they have none from *Ammianus*, in the above cited place : For he there says,

In Socrat H.E.  
l. 2. c. 8. ed.  
Vales, l. 2. c. 13.  
Ed. Colon. &  
c. 5.



says, (*scilicet impletum*) that *Constantius*, was very well satisfied with the validity of *Athanasius's* Synedical Deposition, in the Synods of *Tyre* and *Antioch*; and his great desire to have the Bishop of *Rome's* concurrence in it, was not because he believ'd him to have, *Potestatem privativam*, a power to null and render it ineffectual; but *cumulativam*, a power to add strength and vigor to it, as the first and most potent Bishop in Christendom.

And, as to *Julius's* plea, (to say some thing of it) I am well assur'd that there was no such universal Canon in those days, because there is none such extant, nor any footsteps of it. And if we consult the Epistle at large, in *Athanasius's* second \* *Apology*,  
 \* *Pag. 744.*  
 we shall find, that when he pleads a Custom, *ut vobis primum scribatur, ut hinc quod iustum est definiri possit, That the Bishop of Rome should be first wrote unto, and the Definitions come from him*; he contends only for the Authority of the present *Roman Synod*, which he had then call'd, for the deciding *Athanasius's* cause; to which the *Eusebians* refus'd to come † upon trifling reasons: Neither, I say, will any Church Law or Practice be found in † *Athanas. de Synod. Ep. ad S. lita. pag. 818, 819.* those early days, which makes it unlawful for a Metropolitan to have a Synod, where the Bishop of *Rome* is not present, or, if he has not notice of it: Within a few years after the Council of *Antioch*, there was a Law made in the *Sardican Synod*, *That if any Bishop found himself injur'd by his Comprovincial, he might appeal to the Bishop of Rome, and that his determination should be good*: but how could they appeal to him, if he was to be present in every Provincial Synod? Or what good would it do them? And this possibly might be the Law of the Church, which *Julius* is said, in ‖ *Theodoris*, to have followed, when he call'd *Athanasius*, ‖ *L. 2. c. 4: τὸ τὴν ἐκκλησίαν οἰκίας ἐπὶ τοὺς ἐπίσκοπους ὁμοῦ.* and the *Eusebians* (they having inform'd *Julius* against him) to *Rome*, that *Athanasius* might there plead his cause before them; but this supposes some Provincial Synod, in which the Bishop of *Rome* had never sat as a Judge: So far is it from forbidding them: Besides *Julius* requires the *Eusebians* to bring their cause before him to *Rome*, by reason of its greater note, and as a City of greater eminency in the World, according to the account, we have of his Epistle in *Athanasius*,  
 \* *Apolog. pag. 744.*

But what-ever the advantage was which *Constantius* promised himself in calling this Council of *Millane*, and having the Bishop of *Rome's* presence in it, he was wholly baw'd of it, and it came to nothing: For very few of the *Eastern Bishops* † ap-  
 † *Socrat. Socr. ibid. supras*  
 pear'd

pear'd, by reason of the great age of some of them; and the great length of the Journey; which pretence kept others away: But above three hundred Bishops came to it from the *West*, who soon over rul'd those few *Oriental*s that were present; and requir'd that the Sentence which had been pronounc'd against *Athanasius* at *Tyre*, should be confirm'd; the *Occidentals* alledging that these accusations which they brought against him were false and scandalous, and managed with a design to over-throw the *Nicene* Faith: and upon this the Council was dissolved. But *Constantius*, like a she Bear bereav'd of her whelps, takes hence an opportunity to exercise his further rage and arbitrariness upon the Church; and, as we observ'd a little before out of *Ammianus*, that he had wrote himself Lord of the whole Earth, and assumed the attribute of eternity, he now makes him self Lord of the things in Heaven, which the Father committed to the Son, and the Son to the Church Officers; without any regard to the contrary practice of his Father *Constantine*, and the Constitution of the Empire, or, which is more to the Institution and Practice of the Church of God. And as \* *Athanasius* gives us the account, He made his Palace the Tribunal, for the hearing of spiritual causes, and himself the Chief Judge of them: and when he saw the Accusers to be perplexed, and at a stand, himself helped them out; and, through his power, those that were falsely accused had not liberty to speak for themselves: And particularly, when the Catholick Bishops made it to appear, that † *Athanasius* was innocent, because *Valens* and *Ursacius*, who were his accusers, had repented, and that their evidence ought not to be receiv'd; rising up he said, I am *Athanasius's* Accuser, believe them in my Name. And when *Paulinus* Bishop of *Trevers*, *Lucifer* of *Sardinia*, *Eusebius* of *Versellis*, *Dionysius* of *Millane* and ( as *Theodorit* says ) *Liberius* of *Rome*, were call'd before him, and commanded by him to subscribe to his Imperial Sentence against *Athanasius*, they being amazed at his new measures, and telling him that they were not according to the Ecclesiastical Canon, he immediatly adjoyn'd, || that which I will is to be a Law: [Either obey me, as the Bishops of Syria have done, or I'll banish you also: And thus in his own Right and Name, *Athanasius* was remov'd, with the just now mention'd Catholick Bishops: Of which *Socrates*, *Theodorit*, and *Sozomen*, gives us an account.

Neither was *Constantius* more willing and forward to this usurpation, then his *Eusebians*, *Eunuchs*, and *Courtiers* were to own and

\* Ep. ad solitar.  
vitam agentes.  
p. 861.

Vid. Sulpit. Sc.  
Ger. l. 2.  
Et Hilar.  
lib. ad Constantium in fine.

† Athanas. ibid.  
supra p. 821.

and second him in it : And, accordingly, we find in *Athanasius*\* cited by † *Socrates*, that, instead of *Christ*, they named another Lord, viz. *Constantius* : And at the same time that they denied the Son of God to be eternal, they said the Emperor was eternal; he being the man who gave strength to their ungodliness— and, as the *Cataphrigians* write *Maximilla* and *Montanus*, so, these write *Constantius*, their Master, instead of *Christ* : And surely they had need, as the *Montanists* before them, to have had a new Prophecy to instruct them in these things; since, according to the old one, it is *Christ's* peculiar, as the *Mediator*, to purchase a Church, and govern it, as well as to satisfy for the sins of it : the latter of which was executed once for all upon the Cross; and the former is alwaies to be excuted; but never by any, unless the right and power to do it be first deriv'd in a just succession, unto them, from him that || was crucified.

\*Ep. de Synod. Arimin. & Sec. leuci. p. 870.

† Uti supral. 2. 29. versus medium

|| 1 Cor. i. 13.

This is the first time that this judicial Power (deriv'd only by *Christ* on his Apostles, and their Successors, the Bishops) hath been assum'd by the Empire, as such : And these time serving *Eusebians* are the first, likewise, (of any that call'd themselves Bishops) who recognized, and submitted to it, and believ'd it to be competent, of it self alone, and by its own virtue and influence to make way for a Successor, by a Lay deprivation, so as the relation and dependance between a Bishop and his people should be broken off, and cease, upon it. Under what circumstances, and by what motives, it was done, hath been abundantly made to appear : They are surely very black and detestable. And if Doctor *Hody*, and his party, shall think fit to call them their *Præcentors*, and examples, in the case of their present Successors into full Sees; (whether they allow their proceedings to be unjust, or uncanonical, or otherwise, it matters not : Their principles will bear them out the one way, as well as the other.) Much good may they do them : I know others, and as good as they, that have neither allow'd their actions to be lawful, nor to be any just preferences to themselves, or others, but have despised and rejected them : Of whom I here give this account.

No less a man than *Athanasius* is one of them : Who plainly tells *Constantius*, \* That he therein undertakes the protection of a wicked Religion, and breaks the Ordinance of *Christ* : When was it heard from the beginning of the World, that the Church's Sentence did receive its Authority from the Emperor ? Or when was the Emperor's

\*Ep. ad Solitar. p. 845.

Verdict.

*Verdict receiv'd for Judgment? There have been many Synods, and many Church-Sentences; but the Fathers never endeavour'd to engage the Prince in them, nor hath the Prince himself been curious concerning them.*

*He, again, thus says of Constantius: What hath he omitted here, which doth not belong to Antichrist? Or what more can he do when he shall come? Or will he not find at his coming, an expedite way made ready by these doings for the exercise of his deceits? Since he has made his Palace the Tribunal for the bearing those causes, and himself the Chief Prince of them, which belong'd to the place of Ecclesiastical cognizance.——That the Judgment is not of a Roman, or Civil, Business, in which his arbitrary Decision may be acquiesced in, as he is an Emperor, but of a Bishop to which his prerogative does not extend.*

*Ibid. p. 861.*

*And farther: These grievances are very excessive, and the practice of him alone who hath the Image of Antichrist: For who is it that, seeing him, by his Decrees, to make himself a Prince of the Bishops, and to preside in Ecclesiastical Judicatures, may not justly say, that he is the very same Abomination of Desolation, which was foretold by the Prophet Daniel? For, when he puts on the garment of Christianity, and enters into the holy Places, and sitting there, lays waste the Churches, abrogating the Canons, and, by force, compelling that his Decrees do obtain; who, at any time, shall dare to say, that this is a peaceable time among Christians? And not rather a Persecution, and such a Persecution as hath not been before, and perhaps, no one hath made but that Son of iniquity.*

*Ibid. p. 862.*

*I cannot forbear to add these following resentments which the most holy Athanasius had upon the same occasion.*

*Truth is not to be preach'd by swords and darts, and a military band; but by persuading and consulting: But, what freedom of persuading is there, where there is a fear of the Emperor? Or what Consultation is that, in which he that contradicts hath banishment or death for his rewards?——He, (i. e. Constantius) guided by no reason, compels all by force and power: So that it is evident to all Men, that their Sentence is not Divine, but Humane: And they indeed, have no King but Cæsar: For they do what they think fit in the Church by him.*

*Ibid. p. 831.*

*Why doth he pretend to have regard to the Ecclesiastical Canon, who contrives to do all things against it? What Canon is that which provides, that he who is to be a Bishop shall be sent out of the Palace*

*Ibid. p. 844.*

Palace? Or what kind of Canon is that, which licenses Soldiers to invade the Churches? Or instructs the Secular Officers, and the Eunuchs, who have no reason, to Lord it over the Churches? And to publish, by an Edict, the Sentences of those who are Bishops in name only?

If the Church judgeth these things, what can the Emperor have in common with her? And if the threats of the Emperor guid all, what need is there of Bishops in name only? Was it ever known from the beginning of the World, that the Sentence of the Church had its Authority from the Emperor?

*Ibid.* p. 845.

He hath done an unheard of thing in Rome,  $\kappa\iota\ \alpha\lambda\lambda\theta\acute{o}\varsigma\ \delta\mu\omega\iota\sigma\mu\alpha\ \tau\acute{\eta}\varsigma\ \text{Ἀποστολῆς κοινῆς}$ . It is truly a representation of the communion of Antichrist: And, appointing his Palace, in stead of the Church, and three Eunuchs to be present in the place of the Believers, and three of his Scout Bishops, one Felix forsooth, was made a Bishop, worthy of them. We may see, that Athanasius had not the same opinion of Felix as Bishop of Rome that Doctor Hody has.

*Ibid.* p. 861.

The eminently renown'd Hosius was particularly concern'd upon the same account; and opposed Constantius with no less zeal and courage, then Athanasius did: whose advice to him, and admonition, upon his assuming the deposing Power, we have thus transmitted to us by Athanasius. Pray cease and remember that thou art mortal: Fear the Day of Judgement: Keep thy self pure for that day: Do not concern thy self in Ecclesiastical affairs, nor command us in this nature: But rather learn those things of us. God hath committed to thee the Empire; and he has intrusted us with those things that belong to the Church: And as, he who with malignant eyes reproacheth thy Empire, opposeth the Divine Ordinance; so, do thou beware lest drawing to thee those things which belong to the Church, thou becomeest thereby, lyable to a great guilt. It is writen, give those things unto Cæsar which are Cæsar's, and those things which are God's unto God. It is neither lawful for us, O Emperor, to hold the earthly Empire, neither hast thou the power of holy things. I write these things out of my care of thy souls health.

*Ibid.* p. 839.

And the abovemention'd five great Bishops of Rome, Vercellus, Trevers, Sardinia, and Millane, did not spare him neither, when they argued the point with him, in his Palace: As we have it also in Athanasius. But they told him plainly, That he was unpresidented, in that he acted so notoriously against the Church Laws: That the Kingdom which he possessed, was not his, but God's; of whom he receiv'd it: And that he is to be fear'd, lest he suddenly take that

*Ibid.* p. 831.



away from him which he had given him : They denounc'd the day of Judgment against him ; and advis'd him , that he would not corrupt the Ecclesiastick affairs , nor mingle the Roman Empire with the Church Constitutions ; nor introduce the Arian Heresy into the Church of God.

\* H. E. l. 2. c. 18.

To which \* *Theodorit* adds ; that when *Constantius* would have forced them, in his Palace, to give their consent to *Arbanasius's* abdication, and to make a new Faith ; the foremention'd Bishops not only refused, but openly argu'd, and told him, that he *ἀδίκησε καὶ διαγέφυκεν* commanded unjust and ungodly things : for which he cites † *Arbanasius* as a concurring Authority. And says, that he us'd these following words among others, upon the occasion of the Emperor's invading the Church rights : *Τὸς τοσοῦτον δούλους μνηστέοντας, who can remember these things ? &c.*

† *Apol.* 2.

And now, these great Authorities seem to make it very plain, that the Catholics, at this time of day, ( for surely we may conclude them to have been all of the same mind with these above named ) did not place this custome and Law of the Church, by which the fixing a Bishop in his See, and the continuing him there, or removing him, and making way, upon his removal, for a Successor, is subjected in Church hands, and that the Prince is not permitted to perform it without them : Nothing, I say, seems more plain, then that these Christians did not place these actions, I say they did not place them amongst some other indifferences in her polity, which were not so sacred and indefeasible, but that she readily superceded, nay Sacrificed, them, whensoever necessity requir'd it, to the peace and tranquillity of the Church : But on the contrary, that their observation was immutably retain'd by them, tho' the worst of consequences did attend it, from any, either Sovereign, Coercive Power, or irresistible Party ; the evils being greater, by a relaxation, and compliance, then any future good that can possibly accrue unto the Church of God. Surely the exercise of that power, the violation of which is a breach of the Ordinance of Christ, the work of Antichrist, unjust and ungodly, unpresided by its novelty, and not to be receiv'd into a Christians thoughts, ( for as such they characterize it, and worse, in the foremention'd citations ) is not an indifferent thing ; nor can they, who have so stigmatized it, be conceiv'd to have thought it a matter of so little moment, as Doctor *Hody* does : Surely these first Christians did not think the outward peace and tranquillity of the Church to be an equivalent for the damage she would receive, by such a secular

Ministration.

Ministration, if vouch'd, and submitted to, by them. What persecutions did they not suffer, and patiently undergo, in the loss of their Estates and Liberties, nay in their capacities of officiating to their people in holy things, rather than yeild in this point ? And though we cannot prove, that any one *Bishop in the three first Centuries was disown'd by the Church, because he was put into the place of another deposed by the civil authority*, ( as the Doctor unreasonably demands of us ) because no one Emperor, within that space of time did act such a work of *Antichrist* : Yet since the Doctor has extended his *Epoche*, in another \* place, to this day : We can prove to the contrary, and that it has been done over and over again by more than one Bishop, since these following most eminent Bishops in the fourth Century, viz. *Liberius, Athanasius, Paulinus, Lucifer Calaritanus, Eusebius, and Dionysius*, are recorded to have disown'd their Successors plac'd upon them by *Constantius*, who had unjustly and uncanonically depriv'd them, because he depriv'd them meerly by a secular Force, believing it insufficient to void a See, tho' that force be *Sovereign, Coercive and Irresistible* : ( As surely *Constantius's* arm was ) and if incompetent to effect a just vacancy, then incompetent also to legitimate a Succession upon it.

\* To the Reader.

## S E C T. I I.

I Am very well assured that Doctor *Hody* will here reply, as he does upon several other occasions and say ; that though the deprivation of the foremention'd Bishops was *unjust and uncanonical*, yet that was not the reason, why those Bishops refus'd to acknowledg and submit unto it, and to the Successors which were placed over them : But because those Successors were *Arians* : If they had been *Orthodox*, they would have acquiesced and communicated with them. But this will be found one of the Doctor's mistakes, which he is frequently guilty of. For † *Theodorit* says in express words, that the Synod of *Millane* was conven'd on purpose to give credit and Authority to *Athanasius's* deposition, in the Synod of *Tyre*. And the other two Historians say the same in effect : But when *Constantius* found that he was not able to carry it, the *Western* Bishops running as one man against it, he remov'd the Synod into his Palace, resolving to carry it by his own Authority and Power : And in the virtue of it, he there depos'd *Athanasius* with a non obstante; although the Law, the

† L. 2. c. 15.

Canons, Justice, and all the *Western* Bishops, were against it, and disallow'd it : And this is the usurped right and power, which the true Church of God, there, and then, oppos'd, and protested against : not fearing the wrath of the King, nor the persecutions, which fell upon them, by reason of it.

\*Vid. Socrat. l.  
1. c. 19. Theod.  
l. 1. c. 14. Jer.  
adv. Lucifer.

For the further clearing of this point, not only in relation to the Council of *Millane*, but to all the Councils which were between it and the Council of *Nicea*, and a while after it; in which the *Eusebians* \* plaid their parts against *Atbanasius*, and the Catholick Bishops, which adher'd unto him; I do here undertake to prove, that from the time that *Arianism* was condemn'd, and cast out of the Church, by the Fathers of the Council of *Nicea*, (upon which Condemnation, not only the Bishops which had oppos'd the Council, but *Arius* himself, came in, and subscrib'd to the Article of *one Substance*, and renounc'd their opposite heresy) until some little time after the Council of *Millane*, *Arianism* was not openly asserted and maintained in any of those Councils, held within that interval, much less was it restor'd, settled and made Law, in the Church and Empire; as the Doctrine of the *eternal Generation* had been establish'd before, and was, after *Valens's* Persecution, when *Theodosius* corroborated the *Nicene Faith*, by his secular arm, as *Constantine* did, upon that Council's declaring for it : But on the contrary, *Constantius* and every single Bishop, some time or other; and every Council alwaies, if it did any thing concerning it, continued in appearance to abhor it : And accordingly, declar'd and protested against it : And profess'd and maintain'd the coessential and coeternal Nature of the Father and the Son, in the full sense and importance, of the *Nicene Faith* : They only omitted the word *ὁμοούσιος* or *consubstantial*; but without making any exceptions against it. And they thought (at least pretended, that, since the thing and Mystery were receiv'd, the expression and explication might make disputes, but would add nothing, in reality to it. And what ever else *Constantine*, *Constantius*, and their *Eusebians*, contriv'd and practis'd against *Atbanasius*, was in order to his Deposition, and final removing, from his Ministry, and Church, at *Alexandria*, which thing they endeavour'd to effect; not by articling against him as an *Homousian*; they did not once attempt it; but by arraigning him as one, *That impos'd tribute on the Emperor's Subjects; that was a traitor and rebel to Constantius, in that he supply'd one Philumenus with money, who was his enemy; that he made*

enmity.

enmity betwixt him and his Brother Constant, and assisted Mag-  
 nentius, the Tyrant, against him; that one time, he stopp'd the gift  
 of corn which the Emperors liberality bestow'd on Constantinople, and  
 was to come from Egypt; another time converted it to his own use;  
 that he murder'd Arsenius, and practic'd Magick; that he violently entred  
 into Ischyra's Chappel, and broke his consecrated Chalice; violated the  
 Canons of the Church; was guilty of Incontinency; &c. Of which  
 our Histories have given an account at large. And as they  
 proceeded upon one, or more of these, when they actually de-  
 pos'd him, and put Gregorius in his Chair; so, when he refus'd  
 to submit to their Sentence, and own the Successor, which they  
 put upon him, and the Catholick Bishops, his Brethren, united  
 with him in it; it was because they lookt upon his removal to  
 be unjust and uncanonical; whether as executed by their Bi-  
 shops in their Synod, or as executed by the Emperor, apart  
 from them; and in both respects to be incompetent. And it  
 was upon this account, that Athanasius suffer'd exile under Con-  
 stantine; and he with the other Bishops, afterwards underwent  
 those heavy persecutions under Constantius, not inferior to the  
 Decian and Diocletian cruelties; only, they were not capital:  
 These holy Prelates believing themselves oblig'd to resist even  
 unto Blood, in defence and maintenance of the rightful Succession,  
 according to the rules of the Church, as in defence and mainte-  
 nance of the Nicene Faith: And that they might no more dispense  
 with a Successor upon other terms, then those which the Church  
 allows, then with a false article in their Creed: And, also,  
 that neither a Synod, nor the Empire, though Christian, could  
 legitimate the one, more then the other: And that every Depri-  
 vation which is unjust and uncanonical, is likewise incompetent,  
 and does not oblige the Colledge of Bishops to own or submit to it:  
 (though Doctor Hody is of another mind) they, herein, treading  
 in the steps of the Ancient Church before Constantine, of which  
 I may hereafter give an account.

And now, if this be made appear, and prov'd; as I am well  
 assur'd it may, by notorious and undeniable matter of fact in Hi-  
 story: (the first part of it, relating to the Arianism of that time,  
 was started, and asserted, by a late and learned Bishop\* of our  
 own, but not managed by him with our present design) there  
 will be no appearing ground left, that the great Alexandrian  
 Primate and his Catholick Brethren, should plead the Arianism  
 of the Succession, as the reason why they did not submit to their  
 Deprivations

\* Bishop Parker  
 of Religion and  
 Loyalty. part. 2.

Deprivations, and receive their imposed Successors : But no man of common sense, can apprehend that they pleaded it ( if they did at all ) as the only reason ; or can think, but that the injustice, and incompetency, of the whole, was a sufficient bar to their closing with, and submission to it. And this I shall make appear, by proving the matter of fact : Which I undertake to do, as follows. And,

First : When the Synod which conven'd at *Jerusalem* in the days of *Constantine*, for the Dedication of a Church, which that Religious Emperour had built there ; the Fathers of which it consisted, who represented the Churches of *Macedonia*, *Pannonia*, *Myfia*, *Persia*, *Bythinia*, *Thrace*, *Cilicia*, *Cappadocia*, *Siria*, *Mesopotamia*, *Phenitia*, *Arabia*, *Palestine*, *Egypt*, *Africa*, and *Thebes*, according to \* *Eusebius's* enumeration of them : These Bishops ( I say ) receiv'd, indeed, *Arius* into the Communion of their respective † Churches, being directed, by *Constantine's* Letters, to do it : But it was upon the supposed truth of his Repentance, agreeable to the *Nicene* Faith. And the *Enzoian* Creed, which he and *Enzoius* || offer'd for their purgation, must be own'd to bear a Catholick sense ; though it was so slightly compos'd, that it was interpretable on either side ; \* as *Sozomen* has well taken notice ; and says it was the sense of others besides himself : Whether the Synod had a just insight into it, or were willing to connive, or were too much biased by *Constantine's* Letters ; as he was too much influenced by his Sister † *Constantia*, and her *Arian* Presbyter ; it seems that the Clergy of *Alexandria* || were all aware of the dangerous consequence of receiving him upon that Creed : And so was \* *Alexander* their Bishop ; he being afterwards, at *Constantinople*, when *Arius* came hither, on the same Arrant ; they supposing the *Nicene* Decision to be directly over thrown by it, because *ὁμολογίος* was left out. And *Athanasius* had not much better thoughts of it ; but says, that the Synod † approv'd and praised *πάντας τὴν τε Ἀρίου κακογεγούνην*, all *Arius's* naughty sentiments : And that no less was design'd, by the *Eusebians*, in laying their plot for their after proceedings against himself, and the other Bishops, then the restoring *Arius* Person, and introducing his Herefy : But his wonderful death in a *Jakes*, immediately following, put a stop to it for a time, and ὁ θεὸς κατέσχευε, ( as *Sozomen* || observes ) God himself excommunicated him from the Communion of the Faithful. But notwithstanding all this, \* *Athanasius* there confesses that

\* *De Vita Constantini*, l. 4. c. 43.  
† *Socrat. l. 1. c. 22.*

|| *Soz. l. 2. c. 26, 27.*  
\* *Ibid.*

† *Ibid.*

|| *Athanas. de Syn. d. p. 890.*  
\* *Soz. supra. c. 28.*

† *Ibid. de Synodis*, p. 341.

|| *Ibid. supra. c. 28.*  
\* *Supra de Synodis.*



that *Arius's* Party did declare only their good will ; τὴν προδο-  
 εντιν, and did not appear above board : though their plot was  
 thorowly teen into by thinking men : And themselves were  
 sensible of it : And, it being not then ripe, nor for their ad-  
 vantage openly to appear, and directly state their case, and  
 produce their proofs, in order to a palliation, and the better  
 recommending themselves, they procure a new Synod at *Antioch*,  
 in which γὰρ οὐκ ἀπαρίστας, they make several alterations, and  
 here begins that trade which they manag'd by steps : And at  
 length obtain'd their end : As I am to give an account.

The plain truth is; of which I will here again give an ac-  
 count, in part, tho' I have done it but a leaf or two before;  
 as *Arius's* subscription did no wayes come from his heart, but  
 was altogether forc'd, and hypocritical : Perhaps no man that  
 pretended to integrity acted such a part before, or since, as he  
 did, when he made it; according to the account which \* *Soc-  
 crates* gives of it, which is this : *That he wrote his Heretical Thesis* \* *H. E. l. i. c. 6.*  
*in a Paper, and holding it under his arm at the time he subscrib'd,*  
*he swore he did truly, and without any reserve, think as he had*  
*written :* meaning, in his paper, which he had then under his  
 arm ; so he took no other care in his Creed, but to regain and  
 fix himself in *Constantine's* favour ; and have better opportunity,  
 under his protection, to eject *Athanasius*, and some other Catho-  
 lick Bishops, and place the most confiding of his own faction in  
 the chief Government of the Church, as the most expeditious,  
 and effectual course ( they could not hope to do it by other  
 means ) to retrieve and establish his *Arianism*, and make them-  
 selves heads of the Succession ; agreeably to the plot which was  
 laid by † *Eusebius* of *Nicomedia* and *Theognis*, immediately upon † *Ibid. c. 10. 18.*  
 their return from Banishment : the accomplishment of which  
*Arius* did not live to see, he being prevented by a miraculous † *Ibid. c. 25.*  
 death ; But *Eusebius*, *Theognis*, *Maris*, *Valens*, *Ursacius*, with  
 others of that black combination, brought it to pass in some  
 measure, in the latter end of *Constantius's* Reign. To speak all  
 in one word : The main thing above board, on the *Eusebians*  
 side, was to remove the foremention'd Prelates : Their own  
 beloved *Arianism* was not it : And the Catholics, on the other  
 side, contended, with no less industry and zeal, but with better  
 Arguments, and more integrity, to keep them in, who all  
 along, remonstrated to their Deprivations, as incompetent un-  
 canonical, unjust, and invalid, and openly declar'd that they  
 ought

ought to maintain and adhere to their lawful Bishops and lawful Succession, and oppose two Bishops in one District, upon the same ground that they stand engag'd to maintain and adhere to the Faith which was once delivered to the Saints. The *Ensebi*ans, also, maintain'd their own pseudo-Bishops with the like vigor, and constancy, and for the same reasons. I will only add, that their counterfeit subscription to the Catholick Truth, designing thereby to root it out, puts me in mind of the advice I have heard a great man of our Nation, gave to Mr. Cotton of Boston, when he came to him, and made complaint that his conscience would not give him leave to comply with the Church's Laws; and its persecutions would, other waies, be so great that he could not endure them; whereupon he had resolv'd to go into New-England: Which advice was this: *Pish, you are a fool; stay and be a Dean or a Bishop, and thus you will have better opportunity, and more effectually ruine its Hierarchy*: And I do heartily wish that the Church of God had had fewer such false friends of old, especially in the days of *Constantius*; and since in our Church of England: Even, at present, that too many of the same complexion, were not lodg'd in her bowels.

\* *Supra de vit.* But I cannot omit taking notice, how \* *Ensebius* makes the Church of Egypt to appear, by its Bishops, in the foremention'd  
*Constant. l. 4.* Synod of Jerusalem, and concur with it in *Arius's* reception:  
 c. 43. Whereas that Councils *Synodical Epistle* (as it is in † *Athanasius*)  
 † *Supra de Synodis.* to Alexandria, Egypt, Thebais, Libia, and the rest of that Diocese, solicits the Egyptian Churches to a compliance with its Determinations, and receive *Arius*, which is a full evidence that they were not at the Council: Besides, *Sozomen* says expressly, that the Alexandrian Church, together with the Constantinopolitan, did actually deny to receive him, as I have just now observ'd: And † *Baronius* (though he does not insist on it, as his evidence) may not have observ'd amiss, when he remarques, that *Ensebius* hath given a wrong account of the Bishops in the Jerusalem Synod, and ostentatiously made their number greater then it was, thereby to gain a reputation to it, and render *Arius's* reception more unanimous and authoritative. For, though *Ensebius* was a good man, and subscrib'd conscientiously to the Nicene Faith, and its particular explication, in obedience to the Church of God; yet, as we must allow that he was so much an *Arian*, as to think, that the word *Consubstantial* had been better left out: And to have desir'd the Church's compliance, and to represent

it as authoritative as he could; and *Arius's* reception, without that word; so it cannot be denied, but that it lessens his reputation, as an Historian, by his mistaking the account: And we may have some reason to doubt whether he may not have been mistaken, as to some other Churches, which he avers to have been in the Synod; and to believe, that the Synod might consist of fewer Bishops, to a greater quantity, and be less authoritative, then he would have us believe it had. Though our *Annalist* says, that the greatest part of the Bishops, who were at the Synod, were for the *Homusian* explication, but the *Eusebians* met after the Synod broke up, and determin'd for their own advantage; and the Synod hath been, for that reason, esteem'd a convention, and not a legitimate Council.

Again when the case of *Eustathius*, Bishop of *Antioch*, was a little after contested, in a Council held in that City; where he was abdicated and banish'd by the *Eusebians*, and the Empire, (whether it was done in *Constantine's* or *Constantius's* days, is not material at present) the crimes which were objected, and pretend'dly prov'd against him, were, 1. *Sabellianism*. 2. Incontinency. 3. Tyranny: And though he was a zealous contender for the *Nicene* Faith, and the *Homusian* explication of it, not inferior to *Athanasius*, that was not laid to his charge: But on the contrary, they proceeded against him as a perverter of it, by his *Sabellianism*: And when *Eustathius* accus'd *Eusebius Pamphilus* (betwixt which two the dispute was managed) because of his violation of the *Homusian* Article, *Eusebius* return'd the accusation upon him, and they mutually purg'd themselves: And since a Party in *Antioch* adher'd to *Eustathius*, notwithstanding his pretended deposition, which, for that reason, were call'd *Eustathians*, and refus'd to communicate with those *Successors* whom the *Eusebians* appointed; shall we think that they refus'd, because they were *Arians*, when *Arianism* was disown'd by those *Eusebians*, at that time: And they were as shy in communicating with them, as the *Eustathians* were: † Especially, since *Constantine* gives this character of *Sophronius*, a Presbyter of *Cesarea*, and *Georgius*, another of *Arethusa*, as, || *H. E. l. 1. c. 22.* *In vita Constantini*, p. 812. *Socrat. l. 1. c. 18.* *Theod. l. 1. c. 21.* *Soz. l. 2. c. 17.* *18.* *L. de Synod.* p. 891. *Theodorit* tells us; and *Athanasius* before him intimates, as much; yet since they then acted and

approv'd

approv'd themselves otherwise, that could not be given by the *Eustathians* as the reason why they separated from them : nor did the Catholicks so strictly insist upon the word *ὁμοῦς*, unless it visibly appear'd, that the Faith was struck at, by its omission : So, this alone seems to be the reason why the Catholicks did not communicate with them ; viz. because *Eustathius* had been unjustly remov'd, and they were not Successors according to the rules which the Church requires ; but *Seconds*, in a full See. And *Theodorit*, in the above mention'd Chapter, says little less : Where he tells us, *πλείστοι πρὸν ἐν-σεβῶν διαμετῶν*, many that chose to serve God in the right way, and according to his own Rules of worship, both of the Clergy and Laity, left the Ecclesiastical Conventions, and congregated among themselves ; who therefore were call'd *Eustathians* : For we know the *Eusebians* omitting the word *ὁμοῦς*, but retaining the Eternal Generation, did not make any change in the Worship, or publick Service ; and the *Eustathians* and *Eusebians* might at this time of day, have assembled together, without any disadvantage to one another, upon that account.

I am very apt to think, that *Eusebius Pamphilus* might refuse the Bishoprick of *Antioch* upon the account of the Schism ; when, upon *Eustathius's* Deposition, it was offer'd him by the Bishops and *Constantine* : And perhaps, the manner of *Eustathius's* removal was worse than it is represented, in our Historians short account of it ; and the secular Force contributed too much to it, as it did to *Athanasius's* removal, in the Council of *Tyre* ; and this might, in part, keep *Eusebius* out of it ; for he was, certainly, a good man, as to the main : But the most likely reason of his refusing it was, because his receiving it, would not have comported with the Church principle of *one Bishop in one See* ; nor with the Ancients Judgment, upon *Novatianus's* assuming *Cornelius's* Chair, and violating that principle ; of which we have an account from himself in his *Church History*. Besides ; the reason for which he is said to have refused it seems too slender ; as, because the Canon forbids a Bishop to remove from one Bishoprick to another : For that Prohibition was only accidental and temporal : Neither did the Church ever think her self indispensably oblig'd to its Observation. \* *Socrates* gives us an account, how several Bishops have been translated : And he receives one of them from † *Eusebius* ; and the thing is approv'd by him. And the same opinion concerning the nullity of those Canons, which once provided

|| *Socr. l. 2. c. 18.*  
*Euseb. de vita*  
*Constantini lib.*  
3. c. 58, 59.

\* *L. 5. c. 35.*

† *L. 6. c. 9.*

vided, that a Bishop should not be translated from one See to another, continued in the Church till the days of *Gregory Nazianzen*; who calls them *dead \* Laws*, which expired long since, and then, laid no restraint upon him; when the Junior, *Latitude* Bishops, who had been *Arians*, and Catholics, as the Empire protected them, objected them against him, in the second General Council at *Constantinople*; as having been Bishop of *Sasimos* and *Nazianzum*; and their excess of envy and malice could not direct to any other plea, upon which they might, with any shew of justice, remove him from his Bishoprick of *Constantinople*, as they had remov'd *Paulinus* from *Antioch* before, bringing, by clamors and noyse, only, *Flavianus* into his Chair, when *Paulinus* was the legal Bishop there, by the Church Laws and settlement; for which St. *Gregory* severely chastises them, a little before, in the same Poem; and it, possibly, might occasion, in some measure their present proceeding against him: But of this I have given some account already.

*Athanasius* is the next man, upon whom the *Eusebians* make their effort, with a design to fling him out of his Church at *Alexandria*, as they had done *Eustathius* out of his Church at *Antioch*: And they were instigated to it, partly out of revenge, because he refused to receive *Arius*, as a Presbyter of the Church of *Alexandria*, being not well pleased with the Creed which he and *Euzoius* offer'd, tho' it did not oppose that of *Nicea*, but only came short of it in some expressions: Of which I have just now given some account: But chiefly because he knew his reception would be a leading and effectual step for the restoring their espoused *Arianism*, which they then retain'd with their old affections, tho' they outwardly renounc'd, and openly protested against it. And, in order to this, they prevail'd with *Constantine*, upon their suggestions against *Athanasius*, as a notorious Criminal; and a Synod was call'd at *Tyre*; in which, by the corrupt dealings of the secular Officers, (of which I have already given some account) he was remov'd from his See, and the Emperor banish'd him upon it: But the Allegations which they made, and proceeded on, against him, were, for cutting off *Arsenius's* hand, &c. No matter of Faith was started, much less canvassed and determined, nor accusation brought against him by reason of it: But the Faith then remain'd as before in the Council of *Nicea*, and the *Eusebians* embraced it in shew, and

καὶ τὸν ἡμῶν τὶ παρὰ τὸν ἐκλόπων· νόμους σπρόγγυς τῆς πάλαι τῶν νικητῶν ἀνθερεί. \* Carmin de vita sua Ed. Paris. num. 155. Vide Schol. G. Billii in Locum.

Socrat. l. i. c. 20.

vid. pag 65.



this may easily be conceiv'd : for tho' *Constantine* was, at that time, too much influenced by his Sister *Constantia*, and her *Arian* Priest; yet, his complexion was too well known, to be suppos'd, as inclin'd to desert the *Nicene* Faith, and assert the Son a Creature, which the *Eusebians* knew very well; and their craft directed them to accost *Athanasius* another way. And tho' *Constantine* did banish *Athanasius's* Person, the Faction, as to that, prevailing too much upon him; he was, notwithstanding, sensible of his innocency, as to what he was accused of : And his Son

*erat. l. 2. c. 2.* *Constantine* has told us, that he did it as a means for his escape from the fury of his Persecutors:

Upon *Constantine's* death, *Constantius* his Son, was possessed of the *Eastern* Government : And, what through his own inclination, and the incitation of his Eunuchs, Courtiers, and *Eusebians*; *Arianism* began to lift up its head, within that circuit : But the *Western* Empire continued resolute and inflexible for the *Nicene* Faith, which gave a curb to its growth : And *Constantius* was over-ru'd by the Letters which he receiv'd of his Brother *Constantine*, so that he gave leave that *Athanasius* might come home : Upon which the *Eusebians* were much discompos'd; but especially because he was receiv'd with a general welcome by all, not only at *Alexandria*, but in his way thither, except by themselves : and they did not permit him to enjoy the advantage of it long ; but, soon after, obtain'd of *Constantius* that another Council was call'd at *Antioch*, the majority of which was of their own Faction : And having rallied up all the accusations they had laid to his charge at *Tyre*, and added some new ones, as *That he reassum'd his Ministry at Alexandria, when the Synod, by which he was abdicated, had not restor'd him, that he occasion'd commotions and tumults in the City ; they confirm'd his Tyrian deposition, and placed Gregorius in his Chair : But tho' they made four Creeds in this Council, or immediatly upon it ; (for some think the two latter Creeds were made by the same Bishops, but not in the same Synod) and tho' we have good reason to believe, that they conven'd on purpose to overthrow the Nicene Faith : (so our Historians, and so the event, speaks it) Yet they there openly* \*protest, that they neither follow *Arius*, nor receive any other Faith besides that which was deliver'd from the beginning : And concludes the second and fourth Creeds with this Declaration. † *Let those be accused that say, the Son was made of a non-ens, or of nothing ; or of another substance, and not of God :*

† Or,

*Socr. l. 3. c. 5.*

\* *I. 2. c. 7.*

*ἀπὸ τῆς αὐτῆς ἀπο-  
στολῆς ἀγίου γε-  
νοῦσθαι, &c.  
† Socr. & Socr.  
ibid. supra.*

*Athan. de Synod.  
Arim. & Se-  
leuc. p. 893.  
900.*

*Milar. de Synod.  
p. 227. Ed. Basil.*

Or, that a time was, when the Son was not : Or a time, Or an age, before which he was born : And though the four Creeds differ from one another in some things : The lowest of them is consistent with the Nicene Faith, and fully asserts the Eternal Generation : But the second comes up to it in every thing ; save that the word *Consubstantial* is omitted : It was subscribed by all the *Eusebians*, even by *Acacius* and his Complices, as we read in \* *Athanasius* ; and by *Gregory* , though he was then but Bishop elect † of *Alexandria* ; in their own ordering and account. It's here to be observ'd ; that when *Julius* call'd a Synod at *Rome*, immediately upon this Synod at *Antioch*, which remov'd *Athanasius*, and there, i. e. in that Synod of *Rome*, restor'd him ; that which *Julius* blames the *Eusebians* for, is not their Creeds ; but their unjust and uncanonical ejection of *Athanasius*, and settlement of *Gregorius* in his See : and for removing, by the same injustice, the other Catholick Bishops that adher'd to him : As it may be seen at large, in *Julius's* Epistle upon that occasion, recorded by ‖ *Athanasius* ; and mention'd by \* *Socrates* and † *Sozomen*, in their Church Histories : ‖ *Athanasius* has well taken notice, upon the occasion of these several Creeds, and their variations ; that they made them on purpose, to have thereby an opportunity to serve their ambition ; and by their loquacity, to draw away the simply ignorant ; and conceal that Heresy which, in truth, they nourished : So far were they at that time, from openly professing themselves *Arian* Hereticks.

Three years after this, the *Oriental*s call'd another Synod at *Antioch*, and there presented a Creed to the *Occidental*s call'd μαχρῆστον, by reason of its great length : where they denounce the same *Anathema* the precedeing Council did, against those that said, That the Son was made of nothing, or of another substance, and not of God. Or that a time or a *seculum* was, in which he was not. And super added these following expositions : As notwithstanding the Son is subjected to the Father and to God, we know him to be born of God according to nature, and Coeternal with God, the perfect and true God. And again For we know him to be not simply the Interpreter of the mind and thoughts of God, or the outward Emanation of them, or the inward Word and Con-

χεσθὲν, ἢ ὑπονοητικῶς σύντολμα καὶ διακρίσιμα πρὸς τὰς αἰωνίους διακρίσεις διημερίσαντες — ἀλλ' ἐν πρῶτῳ ἵσταν αἰώναν πρὸ αὐτοῦ πατρὸς καὶ πρὸς αὐτὸν ὡς λόγον τὸ πᾶν παλαιοῦ καὶ θεοῦ ἔκ τε

ἢ γενόμενος  
πρὸς τὸν πατέρα, ὡς  
τὸ θεῖον.

\* Ibid p. 91.  
† Sox. Ibid.

‖ Apolog. p. 739.  
\* L. 2. c. 13.  
† L. 2. c. 10.  
‖ Apolog. p. 907.

Ὅτι δαμεν γὰρ αὐτὸν, ὃ καὶ ὑποφ' ἰσχυρίαι πρὸς πάντας καὶ πρὸς θεῶν, ἀλλὰ ὃ μὲν γινώσκοντες ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ, θεὸν καὶ ἐκ φύσεως, τέλειον εἶναι καὶ ἀληθῆ.

Ἰσμεν γὰρ αὐτὸν καὶ ἡμεῖς, ὡς ἀπὸ λόγου προσηγορῶν καὶ ἐνδεχόμενον τὸ θεῖον ἀλλὰ ἔχοντα θεὸν λόγον, καὶ καθ' ἑαυτὸν ὑπαρχόντα, καὶ ὡς θεὸν καὶ ὡς λόγον τὸ πᾶν παλαιοῦ καὶ θεοῦ ἔκ τε

ception

ception of his Mind, but the Word and Living God, existing in it self, and the Son of God, and Christ; and not existing with him in his foreknowledg, and conversing with his Father before all Ages, and administering to the whole Creation, but the true inexisting *Τὸ πρῶτον καὶ ἀσυστάτως* substantial word of the Father, and God of God. And farther; We believe *πᾶντα ὅμοιον* him to be like the Father in all things. Which explications are a full indication they did believe aright in the Eternal Generation: And the Occidentals had no other objection against them, but their omitting the word *ἀμώσιος*, an account of which we have in \* *Socrates* and † *Sozomen*.

\* *L. 2. c. 15.*  
† *L. 3. c. 10.*

The *Sardican* Council comes next: which was conven'd chiefly for the sake of *Athanasius*, and his abdicated Brethren, whom it restor'd: And it also ejected their Intruders: But the *Eusebians* very politickly, absented themselves, being aware that the Catholics were the far greater number: And that they could not have the assistance of the secular Arm, which they had enjoy'd in other Synods: As the account is given us in the Synodical Epistle which the Council wrote, *Omnibus ubique Episcopis, &c.* And may be seen in || *Athanasius*, \* *Socrates*, † *Sozomen* and || *Theodoret*: \* *Theodoret* says that they made new expositions of Faith in this *Sardican* Synod, and † *Sozomen* mentions the same. But it is plain from *Athanasius*, that those new Creeds they speak of were forgeries, and || he forbids the *Antiochians* to read them: and adds, that the Synod made a Law, which commands, that no one title shall be added to the *Nicene* ones: But the Law is not now extant: And all that those Fathers did there was to confirm the Sanctions at *Nicea*: As we know the second General Council did afterwards; neither has it been, since, unusual for a succeeding Council to give its Authority to a precedeing one: Even when no defect, was supposed to be in it.

But, though the *Eusebians* kept themselves wholly off from the true Synod of *Sardica*, they did not lye still; much less acquiesce in its Determinations and Orders: But they call'd another at *Philippolis* in the *East*, in opposition to it; which, usually, goes by the name of the *Pseudo-Sardican Synod*: And here they made a new Creed; But they, at the same time, declared against *Arianism*; they industriously, all along, represented themselves to be abhorers of it; espousing the same Faith which was receiv'd at *Nicea*. And the Creed which they here made is ap-

\* *L. de Synodis.* prov'd by St. \* *Hilary*, as agreeing with the *Nicene* sense, only the

|| *Apol. 2. p. 757.*  
\* *L. 2. c. 16.*  
† *L. 2. c. 10.*  
|| *L. 2. c. 7, 8.*  
\* *Ibid.*  
† *L. 3. c. 11.*  
|| *Ep. ad Antiocheneses.* p. 575.

the word *Homousios* is not in it : \* *Sozomen* gives us an account \* *L. 3. c. 10.*  
of it : As that they made no mention of the *Essence* of  
God in the Synod, but they anathematized all those who  
assert that the Son was made of nothing, or of an *Essence*  
which was diverse from God the Father's *Essence*; or  
that there was a time, or age, in which the Son was not.

\* *Sozomen* also further says, that they condemn'd more false Opinions concerning the Incarnation, among which this is one: ἀγνόντων τὸν υἱόν, that the Son is not begotten: But *Homoousianism* is not pretended to have been one: So we may safely say, that † *Socrates* is very much mistaken when he tells us, that these *Oriental*s at *Philippi* anathematized the word ὁμοούσιος: For there was not any direct and open opposition made to the word *Consubstantialis* at that time, by this Synod, or by any other: At least, so as to erect a Sect upon it: But all that was done, was by omitting the word; though the discerning *Athanasians* were not then insensible of their further design in its omission; but lookt upon it, as a direct step to the introducing what they afterwards effected, to the abolition of the word and thing; as ‖ *Epiphanius* has taken notice: tho' he gives there a confused account of the progress of their mistakes, and seems to make the *Semi-Arians*, who censur'd the word *Consubstantial*, the same with those that omitted it only, as Unscriptural; and and yet, he afterwards distinguishes them, and gives a plain account of their different Opinions: And yet some Editions have made *Socrates* guilty of another great mistake in this Chapter, which are follow'd in *Christoforsons* Translation, where he is represented to say, that these *Sardican* Bishops not only anathematized the word *Homousios*, but publish'd every where the *Anomean* Doctrine, and asserted the Son not to be like the Father, but to be of another Substance; whereas that Doctrine had not been receiv'd, neither had *Aetius*, who was its Author, then appear'd: And so far as I can find by \* *Petavius*; all the preceding *Greek* and *Latine* Editions give the same account of him; until the *Colen* Edition; which in stead of ἀνομιὰς διέταξε, read ἀνομιὰς διέθεν, but *Christoforsen*, nevertheless, keeps to the old Translation: when, not ἀνομιὰς but, ἀνομιαν is printed in the Column over against it. And agreeably to the account which *Sozomen* gives of these Bishops here; as it is above related out of him, upon the success of the *Sardican* Council, which the two Emperors, *Constantius* and *Constans*, abetted, all the World

\* Animadvers.  
in Epiphan. he-  
ref 73. num. 2.

Opinionem quod  
Filius Patrē  
dissimilis esset  
per literas Scri-  
ptas ubique dis-  
seminare cape-  
runt.

so far comply'd, as to receive and profess, the *Eternal Generation*, and *one Substance* : Though many cared not to meddle with the word *Consubstantial*. St. \* *Hilary* thus upbraids *Constantius* when he turn'd Apostate. *Thou damnest*

*Damnās quoque & Substantia nomen, quo te, & Sardicensi Synodo, & Sirmiensis. pium esse occidentalibus mentibaris.*

*Omne quod probatum est antea, damnare jubes, quod improbatum semper est, sanctificari compellis. Tu Sacerdotes Christi resorbere ea, quæ expuerant oegisti.*

\* 1. 3. c. 3.

*Theodorus* \* gives the account with *Hilary* in part, in his Ecclesiastical History : As, that *Constantius* was prejudic'd against the word *ὁμοούσιος*, but believ'd the thing it self; and order'd those Priests to be deposed, who asserted the Son to be a Creature : And *Sozomen* gives the like account; and with all gives the reasons, why that Emperor chose the word *ὁμοούσιος* instead of *ὁμοούσιος* : Which reasons though suggested to him by great men, are as slender as his adversaries can wish : Yet they serv'd his turn so far, as to take him off from the Catholic explication, and fix him on the other; but he retain'd, notwithstanding, the thing it self : And, as his Brother *Constantians*, so, he was of the same Faith which *Constantine* their Father profess'd and maintain'd : Our † Historian gives it as his Opinion, that the differences which arose in the East, after the Council of *Sardica*, were about these foremention'd words; and that they agreed in the Substance with *Paulus*, *Athanasius*, and the rest of them. Agreeably hereunto S. || *Athanasius* says; that the *Eusebians* cast out the Doctrine of one Substance, in the Synod of *Seleucia*, contrary to their own profession, in the Synod of *Antioch*, held at the Feast of Dedication, there; in which the Faith is the same as the *Sardican*. It is not long after, that, even, *Valens* and *Ursacius* came in with their Libel, sign'd with their own hands; and presented it to *Julius* Bishop of *Rome*, with a Letter of submission, deliver'd by them to *Athanasius* : In the first of which, they *Anathematize*, and for ever condemn, the *Arian* Heresy, and its Asserters in these words,

\* *Athanasius Apol.*  
p. 721. ad Soli-  
tan. p. 825. &  
828.  
*Soz. l. 3 c. 22, 23*

Τὸν δὲ ἀρεβλινὸν Ἀρειον, καὶ τοὺς ὑπερσβε-  
στῶν αὐτοῦ, τοὺς ληγουμένους ὅτι παρὲς  
τὸ θεῶν ἕν ὁ υἱός, καὶ ὅτε ἐκ τῶ μὴ

*We at present, and for ever, do Anathematize the Heretical Arius, and those that defend him, and say that there was a time when the Son*

*was*



was not, and that Christ exists of that, which  
once had no being : And those that deny Christ  
to be God, and the Son of God before the Ages.  
And in this they shew themselves thorow

pac'd *Eusebians*, whose profession of Faith was all along before the same; but \* *Socrates* goes farther, and sayes, that they de-<sup>\* L. 2. c. 19.</sup>clared for the *Homoousian* explication, at the same time; for which we have only his bare assertion: Their Form of Recan-

tation is a much better evidence: † where we find no such † *Saxomenibid.*  
thing: besides, it was no more than was, in that juncture, indif-<sup>supra.</sup>

penably requir'd, in order to an admission into the Catholic Communion ; but a Profession, that the Father and the Son were of the same substance, and of the Eternal Generation, were sufficient for it ; the *Homoeousion* Faith being really, and necessarily, included in it ; tho some men pleas'd themselves, that they did not verbally, and in so many letters, say it. Yet I could be inclinable to think, that they might do it : since their Submission was occasioned by *Athanasius's* success in the Council, and the Churches prosperity upon it, through the favour of the two Emperours : For what will not Men of their broad Principles do, when their Bishopricks and Temporalities are otherwise at stake? Did not they afterwards turn direct *Euzoian Arians* ; and assert the Son a Creature, in the Council of *Ariminum*, to oblige the Emperor ? And it was by their means and incitation, that *Constantius* rais'd heavy persecutions upon all that refus'd to do the same, and took their benefices from them. Of which I shall speak more anon.

And if we thorowly consider, and compare the Acts of these two Councils, viz. the true, and the *pseudo Sardican*, in relation to the *Arbanasian* Faith; we shall find, that both of them have in their *Anathema's*, alike omitted the *Homoousian* explication, and, as the reason, why the true one remov'd *Theoderus, Narcissus, Acacius, Stephanus, Ursacius, Valens*, &c. from the Catholick Church, is said to be, || because, *They separated the Son from the Substance and Divinity of the Father, and asserted Christ to be God, but not the true God; to be a Son, but not the true Son: to be begotten, and also unbegotten.* So the false one \* effects, out of its Communion all; that assert the same. As it will appear to him, who will take the pains to compare the sense of its words,

|| *Lit. e. Synod. apud Theodor. l. 2. c. 9.*

\* *Id. Hist. ar. de Synod. & Epist. pseud. Sard. Syn. apud Baron ann. 347. num. 8.*

Χαρίζονται τῷ θεῷ πατέρες υἱίας καὶ ἁ-  
γιατοῦ τῷ υἱῷ, ὅτι θεοὶ ἔσιν αὐτοὶ χα-  
ριτὸς δηλοῦν ὅτι, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἀλλήθιν  
θεοὶ ἔκ ἔσιν· ὅτι καὶ ἔστι ἀλλὰ ἀλλή-  
θιν καὶ ἔστι, ὅτι ἡλικίᾳ ἔστι  
αὐτοὶ καὶ ἀγαπᾷ.

\* *Vid. Hist. ar. de Synod. & Epist. pseud. Sard. Syn. apud Baron ann. 347. num. 8.*

as I have a little above given an account of them, with the words immediately foregoing, and *Valens's* and *Ursacius's* form of Recantation, abovementioned, are an exemplification of the former. In which the word, *ἐμὸν*, is not. And as this their Recantation was made purely out of fear and a servile compliance with the Synod, so we are to think that it was drawn up and subscrib'd according to the sense of the Synod, and their practice then in receiving Penitents: it would not, surely, otherwise, have been receiv'd by *Julius* of *Rome*. And as *Athanasius* was then at *Rome* with *Julius*, and receiv'd, at the same time, those two penitent Bishops, upon the terms \* *Julius* did ( agreeably hereunto he is said immediately upon it, to leave the West and go for *Egypt* ) so he may mean no more than what their Recantation directly imports by that *Homoeousianism*, which he exhorts certain Christians to follow, who address'd themselves to him in his way betwixt *Syria* and *Alexandria*; as that sense which he opposes to *Arianism*. Nothing is more certain, than that neither *Julius* nor *Athanasius*, would have receiv'd *Valens* and *Ursacius*, upon any other Recantation, but that which directly and immediately included the one Substance; tho it might have been more fully expressive in the explication of it. And we have so much the more reason to think he meant no more by it; because, he says, they asserted the *Consubstantial* Faith in their Recantation, which they made to *Julius*: tho in words they there declare no such thing; but only anathematize those that assent to *Arius*, in his denying the Eternal Generation.

I shall take leave to digress a little and observe; that when the Ecclesiastical Authors and Historians use the Name, *Arians*, within this distance of time, to which we have limited our present inquiry: they seldom are to be apprehended to mean by it, those that assert the Son to have been a Creature; since all such were condemn'd and silenc'd at the Council of *Nicea*, and so continued during our *Epoche*; save, that now and then, two or three, as *Valens*, *Ursacius*, and their complices, started up a fresh, and asserted, that Heresie, and recanted it: Nor is it used by them to represent those that oppose the *Nicene Homoeousian* explication: But they generally represent by it the *Eusebians*, who subscribed the *Nicene Doctrine*, in the true sense of the Council; and all along, in shew at least, asserted and maintained the Eternal Generation, and but one *ἀγέννητος*, or *unbegotten*, never opposing *ἐμὸν*; but drew up their Scheme without it, and thought it to be better

omitted

\* *Athan. ad Salar. p. 826.*  
829.  
*Sozomen. ibid. supra.*  
† *Socrat. ibid. supra.*

|| *Socrat. ibid. c. 29. vers. initium.*

omitted. Thus *Socrates* calls the Bishops of the *Antiochian* Council, *Arians* : When their four Creeds, of which he gives an account, declare them to be as far from those of the Sect that were call'd *Exoucontite*, as the most zealous *Homoousians* have ever been; and that they savour'd of nothing less than of asserting the Son to be made in time and of nothing : And others did the same, when they were not liable to be suspected as Setters for the *Actian*, or *Eunomian Arianisme* : Nor have the *Homoousians* ever contradistinguished themselves to the *Eusebians*, but by asserting the *Nicene* Article, according to its own Explication of it. This use of the word *Arians*, might be exemplified all along in *Athanasius*; but I will make this alone further instance of it, taken out of his \* *Apology*; where *Eusebius*, *Theognis*, with others, are called *Arians* : \* *Pag 616.* whereas nothing is more sure, than that that Synod never once professed it self to be of the *Arian* Heresie; it was then too early for them to do it : Nor would *Constantine* have indured them if they had : Besides, we know that † *Eusebius* of *Nicomedia*, *Theognis*, † *Socrat. H. E.* and *Arius*, recanted publicly, and declar'd for the *Nicen* Faith; † *7. 1. c. 10, 18,* thereby to oblige *Constantine*; and they prevail'd so much upon <sup>25.</sup> him, that he gave leave for it, and the Synod of *Tyre* was call'd, solely for the abdication of *Athanasius*, in the management of which they shew'd themselves true *Eusebian Arians*, who did not openly pretend to destroy the Faith, but to destroy the rightful succession of the Bishops, and by that means, they in some measure effected it, when in the end of *Constantinus's* Reign, they placed themselves in the principle Sees of Christendome. The word *Semi-Arian* is often used by Ecclesiastical men: (and is often wrong applied by them) but it is never used (if I do not mistake) within this interval of time, concerning which we are now making an inquiry, tho the thing it self is obvious there. But the word, *Arian*, is there all along promiscuously used, and applied to all those that did not come up to the top of the *Nicene* Creed, tho it is as manifest as the Sun is, in a clear day at noon, that all of them did not deny the Eternal Nature of the Son of God, and the *Homoousian* explication of it. And if he, who shall peruse the History of *Arianisme* contain'd within our *Epoche*, does omit to observe this various use of the word, it will involve him in a great, and even, inextricable confusion : But he, especially, that reads this Discourse, must needs be at a loss; for we here assert *Arianisme* to have ceased, since the Council of *Nicea*, and yet there is nothing so frequent here as the terms. *Arians* and *Ari-*

*anism* throughout it. Neither will the distraction be less to him who reads on, in the close of *Constantius's* Reign, to the end of *Julian's* and *Valens's* Reign; where the *Arians*, *Eunomians*, *Eudoxians*, *Acacians*, &c. are promiscuously called *Arians*; and, if the various use of that name be not observ'd, they cannot be distinguished a sunder.

But to return to our Councils: upon a further consideration of which we shall find, that neither the first and true Council, which met at *Sardica* by *Constantine's* and *Constans's* appointment, nor the false Council, which divided and removed to *Philippolis*, did convene primarily, and immediately, in the Emperors design, and their own, upon the account of Faith: And that which they determin'd in either or both, was an emergent, upon their Assembling: But they met upon the *Eusebians* complaints concerning *Athanasius*, *Marcellus* of *Ancyra*, *Asclepas* of *Gaza*, and *Paulus* of *Constantinople*; whom the *Eusebians* had remov'd from their Bishopricks, and *Julius* of *Rome* had order'd, upon his hearing their Cause in a Synod there, to be restored: And it was their great work to revise and examine their Causes, and the Sentences, which had been given for and against them: Both sides refusing to desert those Bishops, whom they apprehended to be unjustly and uncanonically remov'd: Or, to receive those, whom they believ'd to be unjustly and uncanonically, enthron'd; tho' the Empire and a Synod had united in the effecting of it: As we know *Constantine* and a Synod did in deposing *Athanasius* at *Tyre*; so likewise did *Constantius* and a Synod in enthroning *Gregory* at *Antioch*: So again did *Constantius*, *Constans*, and the true *Sardican* Synod, in restoring *Athanasius* and the Bishops who had been ejected with him. The *Homoousians* receiv'd *Athanasius*, and ejected *Gregory*; while the *Eusebians* retain'd *Gregory*, and rejected *Athanasius*; proceeding upon this known rule in Church Polity, receiv'd by all who pretend to any Church Government, except *Doctor Hody*, viz. that an unjust and uncanonical Deprivation does not acquit the subject believers of their dependance on their Bishop, so depriv'd: Again, that an unjust and uncanonical possession will not vouch the subject believers in paying their obedience to a Bishop so possessed. And this their Synodical Acts do abundantly manifest.

\* Ep. Synod. ad *Jul. Episcop. R.* apud *Hilarium* in fragment. & ad *Aegyptios*.  
Ep. Synod. *Eucly.* apud *Theod. H.E.* l. 2.  
ca 8. *Athanas.* Apol. p. 755, 757. & Ep.  
ad *Solitar.* p. 820.

First nothing is more plain than this, in the \* proceedings of the true Synod: It being its business to review and examine the Crimes

Crimes which had been charg'd upon *Athanasius*, in the Councils of *Tyre* and *Antioch* : And finding them to be false and malicious, it flung them off, but restor'd him to his Chair, and wrote *Letters* to the people of his Diocese, which commanded them to receive him as their rightful Bishop : The same Synod remov'd *Gregory* ( with the rest of the intruders upon the same authority ) from the *Alexandrian* See ; commanding the people, that they should neither own, nor receive him for their Bishop.

Again : The *Eusebians* first refused to joyn with the true *Sardinian* Synod, for this reason, viz. because *Athanasius* and the rest that had been abdicated by them, were admitted into the Synod, as lawful Bishops ; and having done this they \*conveen'd in *Thrace*, \* Sect. I. 2. c. 16. where they condemn'd and ejected, not only *Athanasius*, *Paulus*, &c. But several other Bishops, who had communicated with *Athanasius*, &c. after their false Synods had condemn'd them, or had any wayes own'd or assisted them, under their deposition ; as || *Hysius* of *Cor* || Baron. supra  
Ann. 347. num. *duba*, *Maximus* of *Treves* ; even *Julius* Bishop of *Rome* : Which 80.

last they proceeded upon with particular aggravations : as the rise of

their communion with them ; as the Chief and Captain of all evils ; as he who first open'd a door for communion with those wicked men ; but particularly in that he cleer'd and defended *Athanasius* ; and they commanded all other Bishops in the usual Mandatory Church language ; † That they do not enter into communion with them, nor write to them, nor receive any writing, nor Letters of

Communion from them. And it is farther remarkable ; that they here proceeded against none of them for matters of Faith, save only *Marcellus* : Whom they condemned as a *Photinian*, and *Samojetanian*. Whence we may conclude, that they would also have censured *Athanasius*, and the rest, as *Homoousians*, if their *Eusebian* principles, own'd and professed. at that time of day, would have born them out in it : they certainly had then, declared against them, as they did afterwards, as heretical, but for that reason. But much more if these *Eusebians* had, then, openly professed themselves *Emoukontians*, and asserted the Son to be a Creature : but that only which they insisted upon, and urg'd against them was breach of Unity and Discipline : and we are moreover to observe, that an unjust and uncanonical possession, whose hand soever gave it, did not create an Episcopal right to him that receiv'd it, tho it was the Empires own hand : for both *Constanti*

Ὁς ἀρξὺν αὐτῶν ἀντὶς κοινωμάτων.  
Ut Principem & Ducem malorum, qui  
primus januam Communionis sceleratis  
atque damnatis aperuit.

† Sect. I. 2. c. 10.

Ὁς μὴτε πρὸς τὰς ἐκκλησίας, μὴτε  
τὴν ἑκκλησίαν αὐτοῖς, μὴτε πρὸς αὐτοῖς  
γράφειν ἢ λαμβάνειν.



us and *Constantine* presided in the true *Sardican Council*; but they notwithstanding rejected *Athanasius*, &c. tho not for any Here-  
 sie; as *Julius* before had own'd and protect'd them against *Constan-*  
*tine*, and against *Constantine* the Great, in the Synod of *Tyre* and

\* See *Hil. supra. Antioch.*\*

† *Socrat. l. 2.*  
 c. 11.

Indeed the *Oriental*s chiefly pleaded their Priviledges against the *Occidental*s; and *Athanasius*'s cause may be said to be the occasion of the first breach betwixt them: The † former then refusing to appear before *Julius* at *Rome*; and pleading that he had no right to take cognizance of their cause; they farther insisted upon it till it became a rupture, and separation: And the other great Churches after this, pleaded the same right for some time, till *Rome*'s potency prevail'd, and swallow'd them up: But the *Eastern* Churches retain their character a part; and do not wholly submit to *Rome*'s yoke at this day; but of this by the way. As to these Synodical Actions themselves, they may be seen at large in \* *Sozomen* and † *Hillary*. A Copy of them has been some time since set out by *Nicolaus Faber*, as he found it in the Library of *Petrus Pirheus*, and it is printed at large by Cardinal || *Baronius*.

\* *L. 3. c. 10.*  
 † *In fragmen-*  
*tis, l. 2.*  
 || *Ann. 347.*  
*num. 80.*

It will appear very probable, that the rejecting *Athanasius*, and not communicating with him, but with *Gregory* upon the unjust and uncanonical *Deprivation* of the former, and possessing the latter, was the *Eusebians*, not only principle, but sole fault, at that time; since upon *Athanasius*'s being restored, after the *Sardican Synod*, by *Constantine*'s order, tho not without the importunity and threats of *Constantine*; When *Athanasius* passed through *Syria* and *Palestine*, in his way to *Alexandria*, and the Clergy of those Churches united in a Synod, and address'd him; it was the only fault that we know of which they then repented; confessing with grief and restitution, (its just effect) that they had voted for his abdication; and receiving him in his Station, as Bishop of *Alexandria*. But can we believe that *Athanasius* would have receiv'd them into Communion, as he then did, upon that single Repentance, if they had been guilty at the same time, of *Arianism*, and had as openly asserted the Son to be a Creature, as they had assented to his deposition; and not have required the same Repentance for it of them? Or can we, by any means, think, that he abstain'd from their Communion before, because they were *Arians*. and for that only reason, and not because of their Schism, and breach of Church Union, in that they assented to a false Bishop, placed in his own See; since he did not require of them the same repentance for the former

\* *Socrat. l. 2.*  
 c. 19.  
*Athanas. ad*  
*Solitar. p. 825.*

former, he did for the latter, in order to his admitting them to his Communion? Nay, when he required no repentance of them upon the account of the former, neither does there appear any reason to be given, why *Valens* and *Ursacius*, having before Recanted their *Arianism* at *Rome*, should afterwards reconcile themselves to *Athanasius*, so solemnly as † they did, if their *Arianism* alone had made the breach: Since, if so? their Recantation had made it up. † See men. l. 3. c. 23. Nor may we readily apprehend, since the Empire, all along depos'd him, or confirm'd his deposition; what need they had of that reconciliation they procur'd upon their repentance and compliance; if we grant our Adversaries supposition, which is, that a present secular, local, displacing a Bishop, extinguishes all his relations, as such, to the Christian World: Or, again, that its possessing a Bishop, makes him a lawful Successor, and ipso facto institutes him in a just relation to all Christians. And surely the Bishops of *Syria* and *Palestine* might have saved their Repentance, at least, their then, Reconciliation had been useless for the same considerations. In a word, || *Athanasius* gives us an account of several of them, that did voluntarily come into him, and purge themselves of their separation, and other unjust dealings towards them; and anathematiz'd murder, heresie; and declar'd, that they appeared among the *Eusebians* with their bodies, but did congregate in their minds with him; and consequently their deserting him, and adhering to an unlawful Successor, was their fault, as well as their heresie: Tho' Heresie there might imply no more than their Schism, according to its frequent acceptation amongst the Ancients.

But, besides these, we find, in Story, several Bishops to have comply'd with *Athanasius's* deposition, and, consequently to have receiv'd his Successor, either out of fear, or in hopes, thereby, to abate the rigour of the Persecution, or upon some little by respects, which that time of trial put them upon; but these Men were, at the same time, not only not tainted with the *Eudexian*, and *Actian Arianism*, but not suspected of it. They openly declar'd and protested against it, and suffer'd to imprisonment, or exile, rather than own or subscribe to it. Ple instance only in these two, viz. *Dionysius* Bishop of *Millane*, and *Gregory Nazianzen*; the first of which hath given a large testimony of his resolution and constancy in adhering to *Athanasius*; in the Council of *Millane*; he was banished for it by *Constantinus*, as we read in \* *Socrates*; who might also have found in *Lucifer Calaritanus*, that after his Subscription against *Athanasius*, he was banished

† See men. l. 3.

c. 23.

|| Ibid. supra.

Καὶ τὸ αὐτὸ εἶπε  
ἐν τῇ ἀναθήσει  
μάρτυρος.

\* L. 2. c. 29.

\* *Pro Athanas.*  
*ad Constant. l. 2.*  
 † *Hist. Sacr. l. 2.*  
 ‡ *In encomi.*

\* *Athan. inter*  
*opera ejus. Ed.*  
*Parisi.*

\* *Sermon 15.*  
*de Sancti S.*  
*Ambros. ed.*  
*Scripta.*

ed by *Constantius*, because he would not be an *Arian*, *quod Ari-*  
*anus esse noluit, miseris in exilium*, as \* *Lucifer* there tells the Emperor.  
 And we have it in † *Sulpitius Severus*, that he subscribed with this  
 provision, that he should not be inroll'd as such. St. *Gregory* ‖ *Na-*  
*zianzen* is as well known to have been unspotted in that respect :  
 But notwithstanding himself gives us an account of his recidivation  
 in subscribing against *Athanasius*, when he was a young man ;  
 and withal, of his sorrow and true repentance for it. Now ,  
 shall we think, that the Catholicks did not then absent from their  
 Communion, as much as *Athanasius* did from the Bishops of *Syria*  
 and *Palestina*, above mention'd, until they recanted their subscrip-  
 tions ? But if our Adversaries will persist, that those Bishops  
 were *Arians*, and he did not communicate with them, for that  
 reason : Yet , it cannot be the reason why the Catholicks ab-  
 sented from the others Communion ; because they professedly  
 were not *Arians* : No man pretends they were. If it be farther  
 said, that their quitting *Athanasius* was not sinful, or a just ground  
 for the *Athanasians* to separate from them ; this will be abund-  
 antly confuted from the sorrow and repentance which it cost  
 them ; which as it always arises from the sense of a precede-  
 ing guilt ; so their guilt, and conscientiousness of it , could arise  
 from no other consideration then their false Union under an  
 unlawful Possessor ; and just exclusion from the true Church, up-  
 on it ; since, at the same time , their Morals and Doctrinals, in  
 respect of other Heresies, as well as in respect of *Arianism*, were  
 unspotted : And that famous artifice , mention'd by the Au-  
 thor of an \* Oration on the birth day of *Eusebius Vercellensis*, by  
 which the said *Eusebius* ( with some perhaps, abatement to his  
 reputation ) prevail'd to have *Dionysius's* subscription blotted out ;  
 pretending, that , if it was erased, he would subscribe : But that  
 he would not otherwise, because *Dionysius* was a young man,  
 and had still call'd him Father, and it would not be decent if  
 his subscription was lowermost ; but when it was expung'd,  
 himself refused, and openly declar'd, that as he would not per-  
 mit his Son to appear upon record to have communicated with  
 them, much less would he pollure his own hand in subscribing :  
 This ( I say ) is a plain indication of the personal guilt that was  
 contracted by it ; and, also, that the action it self was infamous  
 in the eyes of men : And though *Dionysius* had, ere that, re-  
 pented of it ; that was not a sufficient expiation, but its footsteps  
 were to be erased and no remains of it, as near as they could,  
 were to be left to posterity.

As

As for the Council of *Millane*, which succeeded the Council of *Sardica* within a few years: Nothing seems necessary to be said here concerning it; since I have already taken notice and prov'd, that it was call'd by *Constantius* on purpose to ratify the proceedings against *Athanasius*, in the Council of *Tyre*: Upon the obtaining of which, in a full Synod of *Eastern* and *Western* Bishops; (for his aim was to have them all meet there) he did not doubt but that he should wholly, and finally, shut him out of *Alexandria*, and silence him for ever, and that no Articles of Faith were debated, much less any new ones introduced, or old ones cashier'd, in opposition to the precedeing *Antiochian* Creeds, so that when *Constantius* found himself disappointed of his purpose, for few of the *Eastern* Bishops appear'd, and all the *Western* declar'd against *Athanasius's* abdication, he broke up the Synod; or, rather, translated it to his Palace. No business was there done; excepting that he condemned *Athanasius* in his own person, and right, assuming that Sacerdotal Power, which neither himself, nor any other Emperor had done before him: For which he was severely reprov'd by *Athanasius*, *Hosius*, and others of the Catholick Bishops. Though \* *Sulpicius Severus* saith, that the *Eusebians*, being the major part, publish'd an Epistle in the Emperors name, full of blasphemous points of Faith, but the People of *Millane* rejected it; they being eminent for their Orthodoxy: But we have no other account of it, and it sunk.

\* *Hist. Sacr. l. 2.*

### SECTION III.

**E**RE I go on to the following Councils, I shall first make a stop, and give an account of *Constantius's* Inquisition against *Liberius* and *Hosius*: and of their answers, reasons, and vindication of themselves: Also, of their sufferings, occasion'd by their Courage and Resolution in adhering to *Athanasius*, and *Constantius's* disappointment by it, in the Council of *Millane*: In all which we shall find that he continued his first design and measures, though his ultimate aim was to restore the primigenial *Arianism*, asserted and maintain'd by *Arius*, in the Council of *Nicea*; which the Catholick Bishops were thorowly sensible of. And *Athanasius*, accordingly, says, that *Constantius's* severe proceedings against these two great Prelates, were the effect of his study and zeal for it; and preludiums to it: But

*Ep. ad Solit.* his main desire and endeavours were wholly to suppress *Athanasius* : And when he requir'd the assistance of those two Bishops in it, by their subscription to his Abdication, and acknowledgment of his *Successor*; they refused to do it for these reasons : That it would be contrary to the Laws and Duties of Union and Subordination in the Christian Church, to which they were indispensably oblig'd as Christian Bishops; no less then to refuse subscribing to *Arianism* its self : That they may not acknowledg. that *Deprivation*, which is *unjust* and *uncanonical*; whether it be made by Church hands, but not by Church Laws; or by secular hands, in opposition to both of them : And when St. *Hilary* says, that *Eusebius Vercellensis* made this proposal to the *Eusebians*, in the Council of *Millane*; viz. That if they would consent to the Doctrine of *one substance*, in the *Nicene Creed*, he would do all other things which they should ask, if it be interpreted, that *Athanasius* should be given up to their mercy, and the Laws and Rights of the Church sacrificed to that one Article; *Eusebius* seems to mean nothing less by it : Nor is it to be lookt upon otherwise, then as his artifice to discover their deceit : For, he knew they would not accept of the terms, nor receive the Doctrine of *one substance*, in the Synod's own explication of it, though they had so frequently pretended that they were not enemies to it; and they gain'd their darling point against *Athanasius* by it. Possibly *Eusebius's* prudence may be question'd in making the offer, but no other sense can be put upon it, which is consistent with his own, and the other Catholick Bishops practice, concerning *Athanasius's*, and their remonstrance upon *Constantius*, when he comply'd with his Deposition, confirming it with his secular Sentence : Of which I have give an account. Did not these Catholick Bishops rather suffer exile than subscribe to his Condemnation? That duty which is not absolutely necessary, but may be commuted, will not warrant Martyrdom in its defence : And tho' I am to forego my liberty, and life, rather than quit an Article of Faith; I may not defend it by quitting another duty which my Christianity alike obliges me to. Neither may any other sense, of this offer, which *Eusebius* made, be consistent with *Constantius's* farther proceedings against the *Homocysians* : In which the stress of their trial is put upon their consenting to *Athanasius's* condemnation. And, as it is said to be the primary reason of his calling the Council of *Millane*; so it is the first thing to which

he

*Ep. ad Solit.*  
 p. 842.  
*Ilacobiua de*  
*tristis Apli xel-*  
*su wae's.*

*Ad-Constant.*  
*in sine.*

*Omnia se qua*  
*postularent esse*  
*falsum.*



he endeavours to work *Liberius*, and *Hosius*; Which argues that their obligation to adhere to *Atbanasius*, was not an accessary, but a first duty: And that the preservation of their Faith was rather a dependant upon their constant adhesion to him, ( and surely it was so in a great measure ) then that they believ'd it of less consequence, that his cause shall sink, so their Faith was preserved; had the Emperor been assur'd, that they therefore, did not desert *Atbanasius*, nor would consent to the proceedings of *Tyre*; because they were not assur'd that they should retain the *Atbanasian* Faith, the common course of such proceedings must have instructed him, to have first drove them from their Faith, since the effecting of it, would have taken so much argument from them for their adhering to *Atbanasius*; but this was not the method he took: And his proceedings against *Liberius* and *Hosius* are particular evidences of it, which now follow. He begin with *Hosius*, though he be last in our story.

The account which \* *Atbanasius* gives of the proceedings upon *Hosius*, is; that when *Constantius* first sent for him to *Rome*, and interrogated him, it was solely in reference to his adhering to *Atbanasius*, and to engage him to subscribe to his Condemnation; and to communicate with the *Arians*: That the holy Bishop replied to him with such weight of argument; and gave such effectual reasons, why he ought not to do it, that the Emperor was convinced, and dismiss'd him, with leave to return to his Country and Church: but this brought no small trouble to the *Eusebians*, especially the Eunuchs and Courtiers: which last, according to their usual practice, provok'd and embitter'd *Constantius*, to a greater excess, against him: Insomuch that he wrote a menacing Letter to him, to the former effect: with the contumelies and reproaches of which, *Atbanasius* tells us, the most religious Prelate was affected, but its terrors prevail'd nothing with him for the changing his opinion, which he had found upon the firm Rock of Faith; but he retain'd it, notwithstanding, with his first constancy: When the Emperor wrote a second Letter to him, mixing some flatteries with his threats, but to the same end; requiring him to subscribe, and become an *Arian*, he reply'd in a large Epistle, which *Atbanasius* has recorded at length, intermixed with Instructions, Arguments, Threats, and reproofs. And towards the end, he declares himself to be no *Arian*: And that he is so far from joyning

\* Ep. ad Solit.  
vita a Gentesp.  
827, 828, 829,  
830

Mid supra.

with, and assisting, him, that he *Anathematizes* his Doctrine: But all the rest of it is purely and solely in relation to *Athanasius's* abdication: And first he tells him, that, *As he suffer'd before under his Grand Father Maximianus, so, if he thinks fit to make another trial of him, he is now ready to suffer any thing, rather than join with his Eusebians against Athanasius, and shed innocent blood, and betray the Truth.* He goes on, and advises him, that he cease to give ear to the Orientals; and to believe *Valens* and *Ursacius*; since they refused to appear in the Council of *Sardica*, and implead him there, after they had been summon'd to it, and the Synod had declar'd him to be innocent: That *Valens* and *Ursacius* had declar'd him to be innocent in a Synod at *Rome*. He exhorts him to cease to offer that violence to Synods and Bishops by his letters and secular arm he had heretofore used, for the gaining subscriptions, to the end *Valens* and *Ursacius* might have their design'd advantages: He puts him in mind, that he is mortal; that he should fear the day of Judgment, and keep himself pure for that day: And that in order to it, he do not encroach upon the Church Rights, and force the Bishops, in their Depositions and Censures; but be govern'd by them: Such things belonging to them, and not to him, by the Ordinance of God; and that it is neither lawful nor safe for him to intermeddle with them. But our *Abrahamitical* old man, ( as *Athanasius* calls him ) prevail'd nothing upon *Constantius*, by this grave advice: But he raves and persecutes the more upon it. viz. Because *Hosius*, not only refuses to subscribe against *Athanasius*, but condemns the Eusebians for so doing: And declares that it is better to suffer death, then to become thereby, betrayers of the Truth: The Emperor hearing too that several in *Spain* were of the same opinion; and finding that he could neither by force, nor solicitation, prevail with them to subscribe, he calls the great Bishop to him, and banisheth him, for one year, into *Sirmium*.

And if we take an account of *Liberius's* Case, as it is related by \* *Athanasius* and † *Theodoret*; we shall find that neither *Constantius*, nor his Eunuuchs, nor Bishop *Epictetus*, ( which three are appointed to interrogate and catechise him ) move any question to him concerning the *Nicene* Faith, and the Eternal Generation: But all which they require of him is, To cease his friendship and communion with *Athanasius*, and subscribe to his Condemnation, and in the Council of *Tyre*; they tell him, that upon these terms, he may return to *Rome*; otherwise he must expect to be translated to some new place. And to this the Bishop's answer is much at the rate with that which *Hosius* gave to *Constantius*: viz.

\* Ep. ad Solitar.

p. 832, 833, 835.

† H. E. l. 2. c. 16.

viz. That he could not do it, because a Synod at Rome had declar'd Athanasius innocent. That the Sentence which those Bishops gave against him, by whom they pretend he was Synodically condemn'd, was uncanonical and unlawful: That they condemn'd him to procure the Emperor's favour, or for fear lest he should punish them, or to avoid the common infamy which they might otherways undergo: That they condemn'd him when he was absent, and neither saw the matter of fact done themselves, nor had it sufficiently prov'd from others: That their own false Witnesses confessed the forgery and cheat, and asked pardon for their prevarication: He demands that if Athanasius hath deserv'd an animadversion, and the Church censure is to pass upon him, that it be done by a rightful Judgment, and according to the Ecclesiastical form, and the Canons of the Church: And that he values and insists upon the Observations of them, as deliver'd from St. Peter, more then he does his Palace at Rome: And, if he should be alone herein (though he was not) it is all one to him: A cause of Faith (for so he \* calls it) is not lessened by it: since there only heretofore, were <sup>Theod. i. l. 13.</sup> found, that resisted the King's Commandment, as he now doth in not <sup>Ο τῆς πίστεως</sup> subscribing: That if the Emperor does truly interpose his care for the <sup>ἀδελφότης</sup> Peace of the Church, and he require that our subscriptions for Athanasius be blotted out; then let the subscriptions that are against him be expung'd; and all the abdicated Bishops be restor'd to their proper Sees, and a Synod be call'd with these Limitations: As, that it be a great way from the Palace, that the Emperor be not present in it, let not the Prefect be there, let not the Judge threaten, and the fear of God only remain, and restrain, and the Ordinance of the Apostles. More especially, let not any Bishop be of the Council, and vote in it, who does not receive the Nicene Faith, in the true exposition of it: It being unjust that a question, concerning the fact of any one, should be inspected, before a question of Faith.

It is here to be observ'd, that the main thing, if not the all, which these Bishops have, above, contended for with *Constantius*, and his Adherents, is: That the Apostolical Rule, deliver'd by the Church to them, was the Rule which the Ancients propos'd to be observ'd; and themselves adher'd unto, in the abdicating and enthroning of Bishops, and non communicating or communicating with them: And the secular Arm in the Emperors own person, or by his Ministers, had no judiciary decisive right in that affair; but was wholly precluded it, as well as matters of Faith. *Liberius*, is not to be so understood, as if the Emperor

Μακεδὼν τὴν παλατίαν ἢ Βασίλειον ἢ παρεῖν, ἢ Κόμην παύσινται, ἢ διατάσσινται ἀπὲρ λαῖ, ἀλλὰ μόνον ὅτι θεὸς φόβος ἀρκεῖ, καὶ ἡ τῶν Ἀποστόλων διδασκαλία.

or his Ministers, might not come into a Council, but that they may not, when they are there, assume and exercise the Rights and Powers which belong to the Bishops and Clergy : For we well know, that the first Council at *Nicea* was, not only call'd by *Constantine's* writ, but conven'd in his Palace, ( as the second General Council at *Constantinople* afterwards did in *Trullo* : i. e. in a certain arch'd room in *Theodosius's* Palace ) and the Emperor himself sat there in his own Person ; as Emperors have very often, sat since in Councils, and many do at this day, if they so please : Likewise their secular Ministers have seldom been out of them : Neither doth it seem reasonable, that the Sovereign Powers should embody *Conciliary* Acts and Decisions into the Empire and make them Law blindfold ; or without being satisfied in their particular debates ; that a reception and legitimation of them is consistent with the honor and safety of the Government.

This is all that *Constantius* could obtain from these two great Men, either by himself or his Emissaries, in these two famous Congresses : Only he thought fit to try *Liberius* two ways more, viz. by bribes or banishment : But he desir'd that the bribes might be given to the Emperor's two Bishops, viz. *Auxentius* and *Epidectus*, as persons whom they would gratify, for himself scorn'd them. And he cheerfully submitted to the banishment, as that which was his portion, and a Christian Bishop ought not to think strange of.

† *Arbanasius* farther confirms that which we here contend for, when he tells us ; that this was not only the state of the cases between *Constantius* and *Hosius*, and *Liberius*, but between *Constantius* and the other, Catholick Bishops, and that they had only this hard choice, either subscribe, or go out of your Churches : That the aged Bishops were driven into exile, because they communicated with him.

¶ And that it was a thing well known, and in every body's mouth, ἐπεὶ πάντες πάντα ἔχουσιν ; That *Liberius* Bishop of Rome, the Great *Hosius*, *Paulinus*, *Dionysius*, *Eusebius*, and *Lucifer*, with other Bishops in Spain and France, Italy and Sardinia, and other places, and several Presbyters and Deacons were banish'd, because they refus'd to subscribe against us \* ; And that *Vincentius* of Capua, *Fortunatus* of Aquileia, *Ereminius* of Thessalonica, and others that were seated westward, suffer'd great extremity and afflictions, until they declar'd, that they would not communicate with us. † With a great deal more to the same effect in his writings.

Now

\* Euseb. de vit.  
Constant. 3. c.  
10.

† H. ὁ πρῶτος  
ἵστας, ὃ πρὸς  
καλῶν ἀνα-  
χρηστικῶν. Ep.  
ad Solitar. p.  
829.

¶ Δὶα τῶν πρῶ-  
των ἐκκλησιαστικῶν.  
Apol. p. 681.

\* Καθ' ἡμᾶς  
ἰστορεῖται.  
ibid. p. 692.  
† Ὅτι ἐπὶ πα-  
ντοῦ ἐκκλησιαστικῶν  
κοινῶν ἡμῶν.  
ibid.

Now, this whole affair of *Constantius*, *Hosius*, *Liberius*, and many more Bishops, being duely consider'd, can any man think (who thinks at all) if their *Arianism* was a reason why the Catholics did not submit to *Constantius*, and to the *Successors*, which he placed upon these Bishops, that the *unjust and uncanonical Deprivation* of the antecedeing *rightful Possessors* was not a reason of it too? What account can be given, that the Emperor and his Emissaries should urge *Hosius*, *Liberius*, and the rest of the depriv'd Bishops, to recal their Subscriptions to *Athanasius*, nay to subscribe against him, and to communicate with the *Eusebian* Bishops, as Possessors; that *Constantius* should do this with so much zeal and importunity, by argument and menaces, and principally, and in the first place, nay singly, without any relation to *Arianism*, for the most part, if a bare local removing a Bishop from his See, and possessing another in it, upon what motives, and by what hands soever, especially when unjust and incompetent, did, upon Church Principles, oblige them to desert the Bishop so remov'd, and receive the Bishop so possess'd, and indemnifie them in each? Or, how came it to pass, that the Emperor and his Agents were so inconsiderate, and unwary, as not to command them to do it, upon Church Principles, and Conscience? Surely nothing is more plain and self evident, than that *Athanasius*, *Hosius*, and their Associates and Dependants, did not believe the Empire alone, their Synods alone, or both united, were competent for it: Or that Church Principles would justify them in it: Why, if they believ'd otherwise, did they plead all along, and peremptorily insist upon the justice of their own, and the injustice of their adversaries Cause? And even plead the incompetency of their evidence, indeed, of every thing else, which was urged against them. Again, must not *Athanasius*, *Hosius*, &c. be very unthinking men, when they plead the Laws and Canons of the Church in their own defence, as most sacred, and inviolable, as the indispensable Rules in their Case, and when they suffer'd in the Observation of them, and when they requir'd a lawful Synod to determine, apart from the Prince and his Substitutes, and that the Church Power, but *neither of them*, should exercise Jurisdiction in it? What need all these Allegations, when, at the same time, they knew themselves oblig'd to quit these *Eusebian Successors*, or any other, purely, and solely upon the account of their being *Arians*? And such the *Dofcor* contends, they believ'd the *Eusebian Successors* to be. When also, as he farther says, It was a Maxim of the Antients,



cients, That no Law, or Custom of the Church was so sacred and inviolable, but they were to be sacrific'd to the outward Peace of the Church, whensoever necessity requir'd : And that Necessity and Convenience were the only Legislators ? If they had been *Arian*. *Arians*, all the formalities of Law and Right could not have justify'd a Communion with 'em: and if they were not, being *Possessors*, by a Supream Secular Coercive Power (upon *Hodian* principles) neither *Law*, nor *Custom*, but *Necessity* and *Convenience*, would legitimate a Communion in opposition to them: So why these Bishops pleaded *Law* and *Custom* at all, if the *Doctor's* Principles steer'd them, is altogether unaccountable. Some men have been so bold with the Ancients, as to characterize them as weak heads, but honest meaning men : and *Liberius* and *Hosius*, &c. did certainly answer the first part of the Character, upon Dr. *Hud's* supposition. For, who, but addle-heads, would have gone into banishment, and have been ready to suffer whatever else the Power of the Empire, and their keenest enemies, were capable to lay upon them, rather than lay aside those Laws, and Canons, and Customs, which only oblige so far, as the observation of them was consistent with their own and the Church's *Peace and Tranquillity*, (i. e. in plain English, so far as they could observe them, and enjoy their ease and revenues) when they stood alone, and all the World was against them, as it was against *Liberius*.

## S E C T. IV.

I Now come in course to the Council of *Sirmium* ; for I need not stick to affirm, that it was after the Council of *Millan*, since \* *Athanasius*, † *Socrates*, ‡ and *Sozomen* tells us, that *Hosius* came unwillingly to it, and was there, forc'd, through their tortures upon his aged body, he being above an hundred years old, to subscribe against *Athanasius*, after he had refus'd to do it in the Council of *Millan*, and suffer'd an years Imprisonment for it. Now, it was in this Council that our *Eusebians* began to unmask, and shew themselves abroad, tho' not so openly and barefac'd as they did a little after : but upon the opening of it they dissembled their opinion for some time, as they had formerly done, and seemingly contended for the Doctrine of the *Nicene* Faith, with their usual Zeal, and by new Arguments : and as they drew up three forms of Faith, (whether the two latter were compos'd during the

\* *Ep. ad Solitar.*† *L. 2. C. 26.*‡ *L. 4. C. 5.*

the time of the Council, or by the same Bishops, tho' not by all of them, a little after, I shall not enquire at present) so in the first, which was certainly made while the Council sat, they condemn'd *Photinus* \* as a Follower of the Doctrine of *Sabellius* and *Paulus Samosatenus*, in that he asserted the Son to have no other being, but that which he receiv'd in the Womb of the Virgin, and remov'd him from his Bishoprick of *Sirmium*, having denounc'd five and twenty *Anathemas* against his Heresie. But because their having done this did not sufficiently vindicate their Orthodoxy, and rescue them from the mark of primigenial *Arians*, since, tho' they had declar'd the Son to have had a being ere he came into the Womb, they might at the same time believe that pre-existing being to have been created in time, and either, *ἐξ ἄκων* of nothing, or to be, *ἑτεροῦς*, of another substance, and not of the same Substance with the Father, so they were notwithstanding liable to be suspected as *Exoukontians*, or *Heterousians*, by each commonly thinking person, they took care to have the ground of these suspicions remov'd, and their first *Anathema* is this; (for which they had Presidents in their own *Antiochian* and *Sardinian* Councils, recited above, but I will repeat them) *† The Holy Catholick Church doth reject those from her communion, who say, that the Son is made of nothing, or of another substance, and not of the Substance of God, and that there was a time, or age, in which he was not. And added. || If any one doth say that the Son is made by the will of God, as one of the Creatures, let him be Anathema*: In which they come fully up to the Sense of the *Nicene* Article, only they declin'd the *Homousian* explication, as they had done all a long before: but neither did they now oppose it, nor declare the *Homousian's* retaining it to be a just ground for their separation from them: neither did the *Homousians* account them Hereticks.

And here we have a just occasion to take farther notice, that it could not be a pretence of Faith in the Incarnation, for which *Constantinus* banish'd *Hosius* and *Liberius*, since they, and the *Eusebians*, hitherto outwardly profess'd and embrac'd one and the same Faith in it: but it was (as I have above prov'd) because those two great Bishops could not betray the Rights of the Church with which *Christ* had invest'd her, by submitting to an unjust and uncanonical Deprivation and Succession upon it, tho' they were made, even by a Synod, as when *Athanasius* was depos'd at *Tyre* and *Antioch*, and the *Antiochians* had enjoin'd *Gregory* in his

\* *Sozom. ibid. Socrat. l. 2. c. 24, 25. Athanas. de Synod. p. 500. Hilar. de Synod. advers. Arian. in initio* *Op. p. 230. Ed. Basil.*

† *Τίς δὲ λέγει  
λας ἐξ ἄκων  
τὸν υἱόν, ἢ  
ἐτεροῦς ὑπο-  
στάσεως, καὶ μὴ  
ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ, καὶ  
ὅτε ἦν ποτε  
καὶ διὸν ὅτε ἐκ  
ἦν, ἀλλοτεῖος  
ἦν ἐν ἡμέρᾳ  
καὶ ὁρίσας ἐκ-  
κλησίαν.* *||* *Εἰ τις βου-  
λήσεται τὸ θεῖον  
ὡς ἐκ τοῦ  
κτιστάδων γε-  
γενῆσθαι λεγόν-  
των υἱόν τοῦ θεοῦ,  
ἀνάθεμα ἔστω.*

Chair: much less, *when by the Secular Arm only*, as when by *Constantius*, in his Palace at *Millan*: Performances of that nature being then alone valid and to be obey'd, when they are done according to those Rules which the Church can own, and when her Canons and Laws, for that purpose, are not therein violated: in the preservation of which, as well as of his Faith, each Christian Bishop is to look upon himself *indispensably* concern'd and engag'd: and he is to quit, not only his Palace, (as *Liberius* declar'd) and so much of the practise of his Ministry, as an exile State will render him incapable to discharge, but his life, in the asserting and maintaining of them.

But this first Creed, and the *Anathemata* against *Photinus* which they annex'd to it, were made purely to serve a turn, their Politicks instructing them to manage their disguise a while longer: that expression which we may find in one of their *Anathemata*, where the *Son* is said to administer to the *Father* in the Work of the Creation, does a little unveil them, and create a suspicion of their design, tho' the Ancients have made use of it very innocently. They did not miss of the craft of most Hereticks, in that they denounc'd these *Anathemata* before they declar'd themselves, it being their usual artifice to oppose some one, or more Heresies with great shew of vehemency, and thereby introduce their own with more ease and advantage, and so they seldom miss of their aim, for the many being possess'd of their Orthodoxy, as they apprehend, in some points, they can hardly be induc'd to believe that they can be erroneous in any other, but credulously receive all that they offer to them. I remember *Vincenſius Lirinensis* \* says

\* Qui ut uni ha-  
rest sua aditum  
patefaceret cun-  
ctarum herese-  
on blasphemias  
inſeſtabatur.

Adver. heres.  
c. 16. vid. So-  
crat. H. E. l. 2.  
c. 25.

† De Peccato  
Origin. contr.  
Peleg. 23.

‖ Hilar. de Sy-  
nod. ibid.

of *Nestorius*, That he pursued the Blasphemies of all Heresies, to make way for his own. Thus *St. Austin* tells us, † That when *Pelagius* was summon'd to *Rome*, to give an account of his Heresie, he offer'd a Book of his Faith, from the Unity of the Godhead and Trinity of Persons to the Resurrection, expecting that his Orthodoxy in those Articles should render his error, concerning the Holy Ghost, more passable. So here, being prepar'd and fortified by the same methods, our *Eusebians* compose and offer their second *Sirmian Creed*, in which, after an unusual Declaration of their Belief in the Father and the Son, omitting all the other Articles, they peremptorily affirm, ‖ That neither the words *ὁμοία* or *ὁμοουσία* ought to be us'd at all, nor to have any mention or explication made of them, for these reasons, viz. Because there are no such words in the Scriptures; and they exceed mans apprehension, and cannot be explain'd,

explain'd, according to that of *Iſaiah*, \* who ſhall declare his Generation? that the Father only knows how he begot the Son, and the Son only knows how he was begotten of him: that it is manifeſt to every one that the Father is greater than the Son in Honour, Dignity, and Eſſence: † that the Son is neither conſubſtantial, nor of like ſubſtance, with the Father: that he is to be anathematiz'd, who aſſerts the Son to have no beginning, but the Eſſence of God produced him, or affirms, That he is not inferior to the Father, (for we'll ſuppoſe *Sozomen* to have been miſtaken, and that theſe laſt poſitions belong to this ſecond Creed, if to any; tho' he places them after the firſt) or, that the Son is not ſubject to the Father as all other Creatures are.

It was in this Council that the Great *Hofius* ſo unhappily fell, and their Doctrine of new impiety, it having ſuppurated for ſome time, broke forth, as *St. Hillary* ſpeaks ||. And as he came unwillingly to it, being firſt ſummon'd by the Emperor \*, and then over-ru'd to ſit, by the induſtry and perſwaſion of the *Eufebian* Biſhops, they promiſing themſelves great advantages to their Hereſie, which was then upon the retrieval, by the concurrence of his illuſtrious authority, ſo he no leſs unwillingly ſubſcrib'd to it, compell'd to it by many and unuſual ſufferings, norwithſtand- that he had compos'd the *Nicene* Creed, and ſtood out ſo valiantly in *Athanaſius's* Cauſe. But, (which made ſome amends) he willingly repented of it before his death; for tho' ſome do contend that he ſubſcrib'd to the firſt, and not to the ſecond *Sirmian* Creed, we dare not contradict the generality of our Hiſtorians who have thought otherwiſe, eſpecially ſince the contrary aſſertion is built only on conjectures: and yet *Epiphanius* † ſeems to imply that he was not fairly dealt with in that affair; but the Biſhops in that Synod us'd undue means, and fraudently produc'd ſome Letters of his, by which they repreſented him to have aſſerted, That the Son was not like to the Father in all things, hoping thereby to gain advantage to their Cauſe, and overthrow the Church of God.

But I may not omit a farther account which *Athanaſius* gives of *Hofius*, || viz. That tho' after a long baniſhment at *Sirmium*, and being worn out with following evils, he communicated with *Valens* and *Urfacius*, yet he did not ſubſcribe againſt *Athanaſius*: neither did he think the former a light thing, but being about to die, as by teſtament, he declar'd their force, and condemn'd the *Arian* Hereſie, and forbad all men to approve and receive it. I ſhall not do the great Cauſe of

\* Cap. 53. 8.

† *Tiquiz*, xj  
aſſert  
Tul.  
Socrat. l. 2. c. 25.  
Sozom. l. 4. c. 5.

|| *Novæ*, & tamen iamdiu ſuppuratæ, impietatis doctrina erupuerat. L. de Synod. contr. *Arian*. p. 236. Ed. Baſil.  
\* *Socrat*. l. 2. c. 26.  
*Sozom*. l. 2. c. 5.

† *Πατρις τῶ ἀποστόλου ἐπιστολῶν* Ὅσις γεγραμμένων ὑπὸς ἑσέως τῷ ἀντιπάλῳ ἐρίαν.  
*Hæref*. 73 §. 14.  
Ed. *Parisi*.

|| *Ep. ad Solitar. vitam agentes*. p. 807. 841.

the Son of God, nor the excellent Bishop (tho' he once unhappily fell) so much injury, as to infer from thence, that he set a less value upon that Article of Faith, than he did upon Church Union, under the Church's lawful Governours, in that he rejected the former, but retain'd the latter, for his repentance shew'd his just sense of his recidivation, in opposing the former, the doing of which is to be attributed to his frailty, and not his choice, but it must be hence allow'd, that what prospect soever, under that dismal juncture, he had of the former, he did not look upon the latter as an indifferent thing: nor may we think that his subscription against *Athanasius* was less requir'd of him by his enemies, the *Eusebians*, nor less acceptable to them, nor that it would have been less beneficial to himself, than *Liberius's* was a little after. But, since it was so order'd by a Superior hand (which disposeth every thing, so as to bring advantage out of it) that *Hosius* subscrib'd to the *Arian* Article, in which the Son is asserted to be a Creature, but did not subscribe against *Athanasius* \*; But *Liberius* subscrib'd against *Athanasius*, and enter'd into communion with the Oriental Bishops, and did not subscribe to the aforesaid Article, but only to the first *Sirmian* Creed; even *Felix* (who was *Liberius's* intruder) was not an *Arian*, but had constantly adher'd to the *Nicene* Faith; and no other reason seems to be given why the *Christians* in *Rome* bogg'd to receive *Liberius*, for a while, upon his return, but because he had communicated with the *Arians*, and subscrib'd to *Athanasius's* Deprivation, or which is the same thing, comply'd with a false succession, and made no satisfaction for it; since even Dr. *Hody* acknowledges, † that the *Felicians* in *Rome* kept off from *Liberius* for some time, and I would fain have him give any other reason for it, but that they were not satisfied in the legality of his re-establishment, but thought *Felix* their lawful Bishop upon his possession; and *Liberius* the Intruder, i. e. a Schismatick, though he was not an Heretick: These things being (I say) thus manifest and apparent to all men, if they amount not in themselves to a rule, they are great and convincing exemplifications of the distinct natures of Heresie and Schism, which two, like other Specificks, have distinct operations and effects. Church Union, in a just succession, and Articles of Faith, or *res personarum*, and *res fidei*, things belonging to Persons, and things belonging to Faith, were under separate considerations in those days, in the opinion of both Parties, with which we are now concern'd, and surely, upon a  
common

\* Vid. Baron.  
357. Num. 41,  
42.

† P. 44. in fine  
pag.



common Principle in Government. Doth not our Historian tell us \* that they all believ'd they were oblig'd to have one <sup>\* Theodor. l. 2. c. 17.</sup> *Bishop*, as they had but *one God, one Christ*? And it will hence also follow, that Schism and Heresie were not lookt upon as substance and accident, and the former thought to have no being but as subject in the latter, and as a meer dependant upon it: or that, as the *Doctor* states it †, there is no rule for Union, but in relation to the Articles; and the even *unjust* and *uncannomical Deprivation*, and *Successor* upon it, are to be receiv'd, supposing the *Successor* be not an *Heretick*. But, if so, how comes it to be *Hosius's* virtue (for surely *Athanasius's* records it to be one) that he did not subscribe to *Athanasius's* condemnation, as well as to the *Arian* Article, and that he was not wholly an *Apostate*? I will not ask why he did not subscribe to the false condemnation, as well as the false Article, because in subscribing to the latter, he must have subscrib'd to the former upon the *Doctor's* supposition, the accident, or shadow, changing, or ceasing as the substance doth, and it is either black or white, sower or sweet, or nothing, in correspondence with it. Neither may it be pleaded, that *Hosius* was then delirious, being above an hundred years old, and under great oppressions, *which make a wise man mad*, since he had a sense and grace to repent: Or farther, that the *Eusebians* were of the *Doctor's* opinion, and that they did not insist upon his subscription against *Athanasius*, having gain'd his subscription to the Article, as not thinking it valuable in it self, since I have shew'd the contrary from our adversaries *own* precedeing practice with *Hosius* and *Liberius*.

Besides, what was *Liberius's* crime? Or wherein did his fall consist, when after a strong trial, and an undaunted courage, and great constancy for some time to the contrary, he subscrib'd at length against *Athanasius*, and communicated with the *Arians*, but retain'd the right Faith, if to own a false and desert a true Union, was not a fault, tho' the Faith at the same time is inviolated? For if the *Doctor* does think *Liberius's* deserting *Athanasius*, and communicating with the *Arians*, was not to desert a true, and comply with a false Union, nor a fault, all truly Catholick *Christians* have thought it to be one. Or why did the Catholicks refuse to communicate with *Liberius* upon his subscription? For we must own they did refuse upon his return by *Constantius's* order, untill he made satisfaction for his recidivation, and its scandal, because the Church Principles oblig'd them to that refusal till his retractation: tho' our Histories fail in giving us a  
par-

particular account of it : but nothing is more sure, than that they did not own *Felix* to be their Bishop, and communicate with him, tho' he was not an *Arian*, (for that he was not one all confess, and even Dr. *Hody* too) nor otherwise exceptionable as to Doctrine: Now for this, no other reason can be given, neither is any other pretended, but that he subscrib'd against *Athanasius*, and communicated with those that had also subscrib'd against him, and was placed in a full Chair, contrary to the Church Laws, by the *secular arm*. Or, why did, even *Felix's* Disciples, at least so many of them as receiv'd the right Faith, together with him, refuse *Liberius* when he was restor'd by the Emperor, if they were of the opinion the *Baroccian Manuscript* represents its degenerate *Greek* Bishops to have been, and believ'd that the Prince could legitimate an *unjust* and *uncannonical* Succession, so be the Bishop possess'd by him was not an *Arian*, or otherways Heretical, since it is certain that *Liberius* was not ?

In short, a Bishop that turns *Arian*, and openly professes himself to be such, may not be receiv'd, tho' he does not formally, and in so many words renounce Communion with the Colledge of Priests, or Catholick Bishops of Christendom: And such was *Hosius's* case, upon his fall. Again, a Bishop that is not an *Arian*, nor otherways Heretical, but renounces the Catholick Communion, and separates from the Episcopal Colledge, may not, either be communicated with, and this was the case of *Liberius*, upon his subscription against *Athanasius*, and of *Felix*, upon his assuming *Liberius's* Chair, when he had been exil'd by *Constantius*: but I shall have a farther opportunity to consider *Liberius* and *Felix* anon: I have here but toucht upon them (together with *Hosius*) that I might take occasion (for the omission of which I could not pardon my self) to expose that crude imperfect Plea which Dr. *Hody* frequently makes, in vindication of his most false assertion, [viz. *That unjust possession legitimates a Bishop, if he be not an Heretick*] as from the Practise of the Church of God, when he tells us; *that such and such Bishops, when they were plac'd in Sees by the secular arm, upon unlawful Deprivations, were ejected, but it was because they were Arians, and that their unjust possession was not a competent ground for their ejection, since it is so very plain, not only upon Church Practise, but upon Church Principles, that, as they were Arians, so if they were also Schismatical Possessors, as their Arianism, so their Schism upon such possession, did disable them, and put a just bar to the Peoples receiving,*

and

and communicating with them: And the *Doctor* ought to have prov'd, but has not attempted it, *that their Arianism, or other Heresie, could alone do it, but their Schism could not.* And yet he insults all along upon the Plea as unanswerable, and makes it over and over, even to nauseousness.

A little after the Composure of the Second Creed at *Sirmium* the *Oriental Bishops* met, first at *Ancyra*, and then at *Sirmium*, and there corrected its Heresies and Blasphemies: and tho' *Sozomen*\* has again mistaken when he says, That they omitted the word *Substance*, and declar'd that it ought not to be nam'd, because it is not found in the Scriptures, and asserted the Son to be like the Father, as in the Second *Sirmian* Creed; yet *St. Hilary's* account † is otherwise; and we there find, that they not only † *De Synod. Basil.* mention the word *Substance*, but declare the Son to be of the same *P. 227. Ed. Basil.* Substance with the Father, and like him in all things: and to this Creed *Constantius* subscrib'd; and *Valens*, who was afterwards Emperor, did the same by his means, but unwillingly; because he could not digest that part of it, which made the Son like the Father in all things, as we find in *Epiphanius*: || And he || *Heres. 37. § 25. Ed. Paris.* farther says\*, That it was afterwards so accomodated between the *Semi-Arians* and the *Arians*, that the word *Substance*, in the *Ancyran*, and third *Sirmian* Creed was left out, (the *Arians* being not able to bear with it) so both consented, that the Son should be asserted like the Father in all things: and the former were very well pleas'd, for they concluded, that if the Son was like the Father in all things, he was also like him in Substance, and in his *Eternal Nature*: and the latter were well satisfy'd for the present, because they had escap'd the word *Substance*; and they soon after improv'd it to the advantage of their design'd Heresie, or rather to the restoring of it, as it was stated and maintain'd by them in the Council of *Nicea*, till those Fathers there cast it out. And the *Acacians* (who made a Sect which arose presently upon it) openly declar'd the Son to be like the Father in his will only, in the Council of *Seleucia* †, which renders him a Creature with a witness. For, if so, every truly regenerated Man is as much God, as the Son is. And, I remember, *Garnerius*, the learned *Jesuite* relates it, That *Theodorus*, Bishop of *Mopsuestia*, us'd to reply, when *Christ's* divinity was urg'd upon him ||; *possum & ego Deus esse si volo: and I can be a God if I will*: and very truly upon his tacking the fore-

† Καὶ οἱ μὲν οὐδὲ ἀκρίτως ἔλεγον κατὰ βέλυσιν μόνον θεοῦ πατρὸς εἶναι τὸν υἱόν, οἱ δὲ ἄλλοι σύμπαντες κατὰ τὴν εὐσίαν ἀπερρήνατο. *Socrat. L. 2. c. 32.*

¶ Annot. in *Marium mercatorem.*

mention'd.

mention'd *Acacianism* to the *Pelagian* Principle, of which last he is there represented to have been an assertor, if he was not the Author, but tho' the *Ancyran* Bishops came up to the *Eusebians* in the Council of *Antioch*, and the first *Sirmian* Creed, and asserted with them the eternal Generation; they differ'd from them in that they *anathematiz'd* the *Homousian* explication, and *consubstantiality* of the Son and the Father, as we find it in *Epiphanius*: \* and *St. Hilary* owns as much too, † but he says it is not in every Copy of the Council. And it may not be amiss, if I here stay a little, and give an account of the several Sects, and their discriminations, which rose upon *Arius's* starting the controversy with *Alexander* concerning the Generation of the Son: for I call them all Sects alike, tho' I place the *Homousians* among them, since I find the term applied to the Christians, as well as to the several Heathen Worship, by our Ancient *Apologists*. And,

1. The *Homousians*, or *Athanasians*, (as they may be properly call'd) assert, the Father and the Son to have one and the same Substance, Nature, and Essence, which they express and explicate by the word *Consubstantial*, as in the Council of *Nicea*: tho' I do not find in the Progress of the Controversie they accounted those that wav'd the word *Consubstantial*, [*ὁμοούσιος*] in their explication of the eternal Generation, to be Heretical, if it was not done upon some visible design for evil, but communicated with them, if they were otherwise unexceptionable: And accordingly *Athanasius* || has openly declar'd, *That, as to those who receive all the Writings of the Synod of Nicea, but make a doubt concerning Consubstantial, οὐκ ἔστιν ἐχθρὸς, we are not to proceed against them as enemies, neither do we contradict them as Ariomanites, or enemies to those Fathers, but we discourse them as Brethren, holding the same opinion, and differing only in words.*

2. The *Eusebians*, who came next, asserted the same in every respect, (though not with the same integrity) and did not condemn the word *Consubstantial*, but thought it the safer way to omit it, as what might occasion disputes and strife, and so they left it out of their Creed, as in the Council of *Antioch*. *St. Hilary* \* has fully express'd the Catholics and their Sense in these words, in the Margin.

\* *Dominum nostrum Jesum Christum Deum ex Dei filium a patre, nec honoris confessione, nec virtutis potestate, nec substantia diversitate, nec intervallo temporis separari.* L. de Synod.

|| L. de Synod. Arim. &c. p. 915.

3. The *Semi-Arians* ( so some call them ) were those , who retain'd the word *Substance* , and asserted the Son to be of the same *Essence* with the Father, and to be like him in all things, but they left out the word *Consubstantial*, and not only so, but condemn'd it , and declar'd that it ought not to be us'd. I just now intimated this out of *Epiphanius*\*, who gives us a large account out of an Epistle, which the *Pseudo-Ancyran* Synod wrote, shewing how they asserted the *Eternal Generation* , and that *Christ* had the same *Substance* with the *Father*, and *Anathematiz'd* all that oppos'd them, and yet this is the conclusion of those assertions, viz. \* *If any one who asserts the Father to be in Power and Essence the Father of the Son, shall say that the Son is Consubstantial, and Coessential with the Father, let him be an Anathema.* The Bishops in the second Council of *Sirmium* were the first who denied the *Eternal and Identical Nature* of the Father and the Son, and that the Son was like the Father in all things, from the end of the *Nicene* Council to that time : And these in the *Pseudo Ancyran* Council were the first that ever asserted the same *Eternal and Identical Nature* of the Son and the Father ; and that the Son was like the Father in all things, but deny'd the *Consubstantiality* of the Father and the Son, and anathematiz'd those that asserted and subscrib'd to it, and erected a *Seet* upon it, whose Members are generally call'd *Semi Arians* by Ecclesiastical Writers : But *Epiphanius* ( who, if I mistake not, is the first that mentions it ) does not seem to apply the title to them, as a Characteristick, when he manifestly makes them a distinct *Seet*, and calls them *Semi Arians*, by their principles and distinct theses. And tho' the succeeding Church set a separating mark upon them, and not unjustly, it arguins't an ill spirit : And, surely, it is of a very ill consequence, when men, not only censure, but reject the Church's Explication of Faith, in order to peace, upon an emerging controverse, especially when it is altogether innocent, and, which is more, contains the true Doctrine of the Article : For when the Son is said to be of the same *Substance* with the Father, and like him in all things, and of no other *Substance*, is he not *Consubstantial* with him ? And accordingly, *Sr. Hilary* says, when I had heard of neither I understood both, and that *Homoeousios* ought to be understood by *Homoeiousios*, because nothing can be like to him according to nature, but that which is the same nature. Being long ago re-

\* ΕΙΣΙΣ ΕΞΟΥ-  
σία καὶ ὁσία  
ἀγαπᾶν τὸν πα-  
τέρα ὅτι ὁ υἱός, ὁ  
μόνος γέννητός  
καὶ ἀπό τῆς οὐ-  
σίας τοῦ πατρὸς  
καὶ ἀπό τῆς  
ουσίας ἀνάστα-  
ς.  
Seet. 20, 11.

Testar Dominum Caeli atque terra me  
cum neutrum audivissim, semper tamen  
utrumque persisse, quod per homin-um ho-  
mension oportet intelligi: id est, nihil si-  
mile sibi secundum naturam esse posse, nisi  
generated



quod esset ex eadem natura. Regeneratus pridem, & in Episcopatu aliquantisper manens, Fiden Nicanam unquam nisi exulatorus audivi, sed homofitii & homofitii intelligentiam Evangelia & Apostoli intimaverunt. L. de Synod. in fine.

\* Si quid ad interpretationem addendum est, communiter consulamus. ibid.

† Baron. an. 358. num. 16. Natal. Alex. Hist. Eccl. Secul. 4. vol. 1. p. 97. Et dissertat. de iisdem. vol. 2.

generated, and remaining for some time in the Episcopate, I never heard of the Nicene Faith till I was to be banisht; but the Gospels and the Apostles intimated unto me the sense of Homousios and Homoiousios. But notwithstanding, neither the chain of consequences, nor the authority of the Council did prevail with these men. (which last St. Hilary\* thinks ought to prevail) Though some † have thought that they were not plac'd among the heretical Professors, nor condemn'd as

such, but receiv'd into communion.

\* Essentia in ipsa paterna, accepisse cum creaturis originem de non extantibus. Hilary. de Synod.

4. And lastly, the *Exukontians*, or *Arians* properly, rejected and condemn'd Substance and Consubstantial; and asserted, that the Son was destitute of his Father Essence, and to have receiv'd his Origin with the Creatures out of nothing; as St. Hilary\*. And they differ from the followers of Photinus, Paulus Samosatenus, &c. and our modern Socinians, who assert him to receive his beginning in the Womb of the Virgin, but they agree with them, in that both assert his excellency beyond other Creatures to consist only in his more regular will and Godly qualities, than any of them had; as also, in his larger Prophetick gifts, and gratuitous endowments of edification. And hence the Sect of *Anomeans* arose, from *Atius*, *Eudoxius*, *Eunomius*, and others.

Having given the Characteristicks of these several Sects, I go on in any propos'd method. And the next, which comes before us, is the *second Creed*, which was compos'd at *Sirmium*: It was offer'd in the Council of *Ariminum* (which follows not long after the third Creed of *Sirmium*) by *Valens*, † *Ursacius*, and their Associates, and its confirmation requir'd, with a nullity of all other Creeds which had been before: But the *Western Bishops* would by no means hear of it, or any such thing; but, on the contrary, confirm'd and receiv'd the *Nicene Council* in all things: Also they wrote their Synodical Epistle to *Constantius*, in which they requir'd his Concurrence and Ratification; as likewise, in their abdication of *Valens*, *Ursacius*, *Germanicus*, *Auxentius* &c. which was done at the same time, in that Council, because they insist'd on the second *Sirmian Creed*, and refus'd to receive and obey their Determination and Sentence. Thus the true Faith of the Eternal Generation was restor'd and ratified in the Church of God, by no less than four hundred Catholick Bishops.

But

† Socrat. l. 2. c. 29. Soz. l. 4. c. 16, 17, 18. Baron an. 359. num. 3. Athan. de Synod p. 876.

But alas ! how suddenly was this face of things alter'd ? What through the unwearied industry of *Valens* and *Ursacius*, ( which is usual with Hereticks ) and the apostacy ( to the astonishment of Christendom in all after Ages ) of the same Bishops ; the importunity of those two restless men so far prevail'd upon *Constantius*, partly because the Bishops broke || up the Synod of *Ariminum*, and went home, without his leave, but chiefly for the effecting their old design, that he commission'd them, as *Plenipotentiaries*, with an unlimited Power to govern the *Western* Churches according to their discretion : And they ejected all those Bishops that refus'd to subscribe to the second *Sirmian* Creed, and placed others in their Chairs : And thus possibly too by wheedling, \* and pleas of uniting the *Eastern* and *Western* Churches, but mostly by † terrors, and a worldly fear of losing their Bishopricks, they soon effected their purpose. So the words *Consubstantial* and *Substance* were condemn'd and cast out, and the *Exukentian* Faith subscrib'd, in a Council which they had to that end procur'd in *Thrace* || : And it was done by the far greater number of the Bishops that had receiv'd and subscrib'd to the Catholic truths in the Council of *Ariminum*, and there deliberately resolv'd never to depart from them : as their *Synodical Epistle* to *Constantius* make appear.

I must stay a little, and make a few remarks upon some passages in the foregoing paragraph, if it be only to oblige Doctor *Hody* : And I should not pardon my self, if I did not give notice of the pregnant instance it affords him of the secular Magistrates practice in depriving Bishops by his own Authority, and of its recognizance by some hundreds of Bishops, ( especially, since he was so unhappy as to leave it out of his laborious Collection to that purpose ) in that *Constantius* hath so signally deriv'd his Power upon *Valens* and *Ursacius*, and thereby enabl'd them to govern all the *Western* Churches according to their discretion, and eject every Bishop that did not come up to his terms, and place Successors upon them, and a whole and great Council ( some few only excepted ) complied with them in it. But the same kindness to him does likewise direct me to let him know, that this Power was assum'd by the Empire, and thence deriv'd upon *Valens* and *Ursacius*, and entertain'd by them, on purpose to break in pieces the unity of the Church, and overthrow its Faith in the Eternal Generation, and that the far more numerous part, which subscrib'd did it against their knowledg and

|| Socr. & Soc.  
ibid.

\* Theod. H. E.  
l. 2. c. 21. Soc.  
l. 4. c. 18.  
† Κορυνθίων Συ-  
νόδου. Socr.  
l. 4. c. 11.  
|| Theod. ibid. &  
c. 19, 20.

conscience, and former subscriptions, compell'd to it by horrors and fears; that they afterwards repented \* and made satisfaction with retractions and tears; and to give him an account how there was a remnant at the same time, which neither subscrib'd to their Faith, nor submitted to their unjust and uncanonical deprivations, nor own'd their Successors, notwithstanding the Sovereign Coercive Power and irresistible Party, neither small nor tumultuous, by which it was effected, but disown'd their Authority, in relation to their false Bishops, as well as to their false Faith, and went apart, † to a small Village, scituated on the Sea shore betwix Ariminum and Pisaurum, and made their Religious Conventions in it, tho' the Persecution did not permit them to continue there long; and the Village was therefore call'd *Catholica*, and afterwards retain'd its name. St. Athanasius says a monument was erected there to perpetuate their memory.

\* Theod. H. E. Comment Synod. de Concil. Arim. by Athanas. Ep. de eodem. l. 2. c. 22, 23. Athanas. Ep. de Synod. p. 877.

† Athanas. *ibid.* Baron. an. 359. num. 59.

And surely there is no one artifice a Prince can use, that more immediately and directly, contributes to his design for overthrowing the Faith, and a Church's whole Constitution, than his assuming a Right, as congenious to his Earthly Power, to remove Christ's Bishops, and supreme Officers, and surrogate others in their Sees at his pleasure, and his executing it accordingly: The late Editor of the *Baroccian Manuscript* could not have represented the degenerate state of the Greek Church, otherwise too well know within those Ages to which it is there confin'd, more lively than he has done in the publication of it, since this Paradox, ( for so it is to the *Catholick Church* ) is there asserted and maintain'd : viz. *That the Civil Power hath an Authority arbitrarily to remove a lawful Bishop from his See, and constitute his Successor.* I have said, *Arbitrarily* : At which exceptions will be made, because it is added by me, and that *Manuscript* hath it not. But since Heresy is the only bar which it puts in the case, or, ( as Doctor Hody has alter'd it ) unless *that Successor be not such whom no good Catholick can refuse*; he that truly thinks will find, that this secular Power, in removing a Bishop, and making his Successor, can be none, if it be not *Arbitrary* : For, if the Church hath a Power, ( what doth the Doctor seem to say less, in his own restriction, than that every private Christian hath it ) to refuse the Prince's Bishop, because he is not such as she requires, but particularly because of his Heresy, ( of which I have always thought the Church to be Judge ) then the Prince hath no power:

power to make a Bishop, and the Church *alone* can do it : Can not every Believer oppose him in it, if as a good Catholick, he seem to have a just cause to *refuse* him? But of the Church be not Judge Heresy, it being the *Greeks* only bar to the Princes Arbitrariness, Heresy can be none, because if the Prince thinks his *Possessor* is not an Heretick, tho' he is one, there is no Judge to over rule him, and nothing but his own Arbitrariness can give him rules, in an emerging case : Or, indeed, at all.

Our *Eusebians* were thoroughly sensible of this advantage their cause would receive by their removing the Chatholick Bishops, which they partly did, by their false Synods, and partly by the Régál Power, separate to the Ecclesiastical, the condemnation of the *Arian* Heresy, in the Council of *Nicea* suppressing it for the present : (themselves, and even their Master *Arius*, seemingly at least, consenting, and approving the Council.) And when they could not hope to retrieve the Heresy directly, ( for they retain'd the same affection for it which they had at first ) these subtle, as well as incessantly active and unwearied persons, made it their business to have several of the principal Bishops depos'd as criminals, whose arguments and industry had procur'd its *ejection* in the Council : And thus they gain'd the Court so far on their side, that by its Potency and terrors *Eusebians* of *Antioch* was depos'd by a Synod at *Antioch*, *Athanasius* of *Alexandria* was likewise remov'd, first in a Council of *Tyre*, and then in another at *Antioch*, and *Gregory* was made a Successor to him; *Paul* of *Constantinople* was abdicated, with several others : And if *Constantine* the Father had not been aware of their deceit, and his two Sons *Constantine* and *Constans* had not approv'd themselves true friends to the Catholicks, they might have cut of more. But all this while they did not meddle with the *Nicene* Feith, but profess'd to believe and maintain it, with the same love and constancy the Catholicks did. Did they not make these Bishops abdication their only visible mark for some time ? This will further appear in that, when they found their party less numerous and unable to vote with the *Athanasians* in the Council of *Sardica*, but saw that *Athanasius* and others would be restor'd and confirm'd there, they either excepted against the place and refused to come there, or quitted it, and the *Nicene* Article was not their concern. The proceedings of the *Pseudo-Sardicans*, who met in the *East* within a while after, and profess'd the *Eternal Generation*, but carried

on the first design, and depos'd *Julius of Rome*, *Gaudentius*, *Maximinus*, and others, upon pretences of misdemeanours, which were not of Faith, are no less evidence of it. They took the same course in the Council of *Millane*, and immediately broke up when they found they could not have their purposes upon

\* *Theod. H. E.* *Athanasius's* person. *Dionysius*\* of *Italy*, *Paulinus* of *France*, *Lucifer* of *Sardinia* and *Eusebius* of *Vercellis*, were there abdicated by *Con-*

*stantinus's* secular hand, and *Hosius* and *Liberius*, not long after: Of all which I have already given an account. It is true, *Con-*  
*stantinus* order'd that another method should be taken in the Council of *Ariminum*, and, by his Letters, directed the Bishops, that they should first determine matters of Faith, and then the causes of the Bishops, † who were abdicated or exil'd, should be consider'd, they finding that their party had gain'd ground in the Council of *Sirmium*, in whose second Creed the words *Consubstantial* and *Substance* are reject'd, and the *Son* asserted to be a Creature: But they found themselves deceiv'd upon *Valens* and *Ursacius's* offering that Creed there, and requiring its reception: Upon this they return'd to their old methodes, and *Constantinus* made *Valens* and *Ursacius* his *Vicar Generals*, with an indefinite latitude, who, by turning out some Bishops, and terrifying others, threatening their abdication, gain'd their cause effectually, and *Exoukontianism* was replanted, and continu'd by the same method, for a good while, in the Church.

And the Children of Light were not less wise in their Generations than these Children of darkness, but knew full well, and saw thorough these depths of Sathan, whose main design was that the Faith might be destroy'd: As *Paulus* and *Athanasius* give

\* *Διδάσκοντες* the reason of their own\* abdication by the *Eusebians*. (*Athana-*  
*σιος* *ἐπὶ καλῶσιν* *finis* says it over and over again in his Works) and thereupon  
† *πιστεως τὰς* they sollicit the Empire for the ejected Bishops restoration:  
*καθ' αἰρεσεις* The same reason we find to be given by *Dionysius* of *Alba*,  
*γινέσθαι. Scr.* *Eusebius* of *Vercellis*, *Paulinus* of *Trevers*, *Rhodanus* and *Lucifer*, in  
*l. 2. c. 16.* the Synod of *Millan*: All of them remon-

† *Ἀθανάσιος ἡσυχαστῶν ἐξελθὼν* strate against these abdications, as the  
*ἡσυχαστῶν* *πιστεως* *ἐκδοθῆναι* *διδασκαλιαν*.  
|| *Μὴ χρεῖται ὡς ἱερὰς καὶ ἀσκήσεις* leading step to the destruction of the *Ni-*  
*Ἀθανάσιος* *μὴ δὲ γὰρ ἔχει τούτῳ* *cene* Faith. These *Eusebians* pretended no  
*γένοιτο* *εὐσεβεῖν* *τὸ καλὸν*. *χρησέν* more at first but to remove *Athanasius*,  
*δε* *τὸ ἐπιβλήν* *καὶ αὐτῶν τῶν ὁρ-* and they brought plausible reasons for it,  
*δῶς* *περὶ θεοῦ* *δεδογμένον*, *ἐπὶ κα-* as, that he was an ill commonwealths man,  
*δαρῆσαι* *τὸ τὸν νικῶν* *πίστεως*, *ταῦτα*  
*σπουδάζειν* *περὶ* *τὸν βασιλέα* *καὶ τῶν, τῶ ἀπείρ* *φρονῶν*. † *Theod. l. 2. c. 15.* || *Soc. l. 4. c. 8.*

that



that he violated the laws, was an enemy to the Emperor's person and government, of which with more I have already given an account : But, *μη σισιδας πικρανδν*, as *Sozomen* well observ'd, this was not their ultimate aim, neither did their mischief stop here : The Orthodox Faith was struck at thorough *Athanasius's*, and the other suffering Bishop's sides, and wise men saw it. And tho' the *Eusebians* had then in a great measure conceal'd themselves, so as their *Arianism* was not openly made known, yet the Orthodox believ'd themselves equally oblig'd to oppose their depositions of Bishops, as to assert and defend the true Faith.

Nor do I believe that any one, who thinks at all, can be so loose in his thoughts as not to apprehend, that the same Power, which has an indefeasible right to remove the Magistrates of a Corporation upon its own terms, and place Successors in their room, and oblige the Society to receive them, may so, and will not, by often changing, and the advantage of man's corrupt heart, overthrow the Laws, and alter the Constitutions of that Corporation, when ever it shall think fit. *Constantius* and his *Eusebians* practice are a sad, but true instance of it, who by these means incorporated *Exoukentionism* into the Church : A full improvement of Doctor *Hody's*, and his *Greek's* principle would have kept it there for ever, if the Empire had so pleas'd. But as *Aeremant* thought it their duty to oppose them for that one reason, and to adhere their proper Bishops, so they preserv'd the true Faith in opposition to them : And all good Christians and Bishops ought to do the same.

I cannot but be sorry, that our *British* Island hath lately given us two instances; the one of which comes short of these Orthodox Bishops practice, and the other exemplifies the Hereticks practice and its sad event, but, I hope, without their destructive intentions. We have had a Synod, in which our Divines acted learnedly and zealously in the behalf of the outward Constitutions of our Church, but without their Metropolitan, and others of our Bishops, whom the secular Arm alone withheld from them, and, which is worse, without desiring them, or enquiring after the reason of their absence : Herein they came short of the Orthodox Clergy in the case of *Athanasius*, and others, particularly in the Synods of *Sardica* and *Millane*. We have had also our Metropolitan, and more of the Colledge, depriv'd (Doctor *Hody* says unjustly and uncanonically) by the secular Arm; and within

within a while after the whole Order abolish'd in a considerable part of our Island, and not only the Discipline, but the Doctrine of our Church disenfranchis'd, and pestilent Heresies brought in, which are very noxious at present, and may be no less destructive to the Faith, than *Arianism* once was: Neither have the remaining part of the College, as yet, attempted their Order's restauration, nor put up one Petition in its behalf to those powers by which it was abolish'd, in whom they may be suppos'd to have an interest for effecting its Restauration: Herein they also go contrary to the ancient Rules and Practice of the Christian Incorporation, by which the Governors stand engag'd, and have still endeavour'd, to retrieve and continue each others Rights in the Fraternity, and the Order it self.

But to return where we left off.

A little after the Council of *Ariminum*, if not during the time of its sitting, the Council of *Seleucia* was call'd: In which the *Eusebians* carried it, (tho' the *Arians* had outvoted them before) and obtain'd to have the Creed of the Council of *Antioch* subscrib'd to, but for what reasons, I cannot tell. The Creed is set down at Large by \* *Epiphanius*. And tho' *Acacius* so order'd it, that he brought another Creed into the Council, he mis'd of his design in it: But upon his appeal to *Constantius*, who was then at *Constantinople*, he procur'd a Synod in that City, in which the *Ariminum* Faith was read and receiv'd, with some alterations for the worse: And, as they assert'd the Son to be like the Father according to the Scriptures; so they anathematiz'd all those that should mention the word *Substance* in their Creeds. And they moreover decreed † That the *Subsistence of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost ought not to be named*. Of all which we have a particular account in our Church Historians. || And we are not to wonder at the proceedings of this Convention, if we consider *St. Hilary's* character of it\*. Especially since he tells us, that *Constantius's* will was the rule of their proceedings.

And now *Arianism* came barefaced upon the stage of the World, when it had been disguis'd and underhand manag'd from the time of the *Nicene* Council to this day.

Before the Lord Christ was denyed in the dark and in corners, to be the Son of God according to Nature, and declar'd destitute of his Father's Essence, and to have receiv'd his beginning out of nothing with the Creatures:

But

\* *Adver. Hares.*

l. 3. Tom. 1. *heres.*

73. sect. 25.

Editt. Paris.

† ἡ ὑπόστασις τοῦ

πατρὸς τοῦ υἱοῦ,

καὶ τοῦ ἁγίου

πνεύματος.

|| *Socr. l. 2. c. 31,*

32. *Theod. l. 2. c.*

27. *Socr. l. 4. c.*

21, 22, 23.

\* *Orientalium*

*in Seleucia Syno-*

*do, ubi reperi-*

*tantum blasphemiarum, quan-*

*tum Confirmatio*

*placebat. Hil.*

*de Synodis.*

Antea enim in obscuro atque in angulis Dominus Christus Dei esse secundum naturam Filius negabatur, et Essentia inops Paterna, accepisse cum Creaturis originem de non extantibus predicabatur: At vero

But now the Heresy breaking out publicly, and with the profession of authority, that which was talk'd privately, among themselves and by stealth, glory's as a Conquerors. For by what means did it not before attempt to creep into the Catholick Church? As St. Hilary speaks. It is become the Religion of the Empire, and Constantius protects none that shall dare to oppose, that will not embrace, it. Before this time Valens and Ursacius, and some few more Bishops did now and then assert it, but their endeavours, like untimely births, ended in nothing, and they repented and submitted to the Church's Censures, accordingly as their principles directed them, upon a failure of success: But Eunomius, Eudoxius, Arius, Eunomius, Macedonius &c. are now seated in their Chairs, and the question is not, whether *Consubstantial* may not be better omitted in our Creed, when the *Eternal Generation* is asserted? (which was all that the Eusebians, at the first, desir'd; the Antiochian Creed was fram'd by them, to satisfy the world that they desired no more,) Nor is it now only contended, that the words, *Consubstantial* and *Substance*, ought not to be us'd, because they are not found in the Scriptures, as in the second Sirmian Creed: But the Anomeans and Exoukontians give the Laws and Rules of Faith in the Son of God, and he is to be recogniz'd as a Creature, differing only from the rest of the sons of men, in that he was made before the world, and endued with graces beyond the most accomplish'd and perfect of them. Accordingly Athanasius\* represents these men to be no better than Heathens, in the divine Worship, which they perform to him, as giving it to the creature, instead of the Creator, which they equal with him. The heavy persecutions carry'd on before, were upon the account of Athanasius's deposition, and some other abdications which attended it, the Church of God refusing to own and submit to them, because they were unjust and uncanonical, and to receive Successors upon them: And the Eusebians policy directed them to begin here, as a direct, but remote step to their main end; that was the introducing the same Heresy, which was not then ripe, and requir'd concealment: But now the child being come to the birth, and their strength having enabled them to bring forth, there needs no other crime, than to profess the *Consubstantiality* and *one Substance* of the Father and Son. And, as Iocrates speaks, The Law of the Emperor, and the violence of Macedonius commanded, that the Churches which determin'd for the Homo-

ninc publice, authoritatis professione Heresis prorumpens, id quod antea surrimus missitabat, nunc victrix gloriatur. Quibus enim antea clauicalis in Catholica Ecclesia non tentauit erumpere. Ibid. de Synod. contr. Arian. p. 240.

\* Orat. 1. & 3. ad Arian. p. 286. 296. 385. & Orat. 4. p. 468.

Ὁ Βασιλεὺς νόμος, καὶ ἡ μακεδονία βία, καθαιρεῖται τὸ τοῦ θεοῦ φρονῖνον τῆς ἐκκλησίας ἐκείνου. l. 2. c. 30.

moouſian Faith ſhould ſuffer exile : Here the perſecution was founded; and it rag'd no leſs furiously than thoſe of former and after ages. *The name of Subſtance is aboliſh'd, and the damnation of the Nicene Faith is unanimouſly aſſented to, when even the whole world groan'd, and beheld, with aſtoniſhment, it ſelf to be Arian, as St. \* Jerom, upon the ſame occaſion. And tho' the perſecution abated in the Reign of Julian, by the advantage of his indulgence, it return'd under Valens, and continu'd raging, until God's mercy to his Church took him away, and ſeated Gratian in the Throne, who immediately upon it † call'd home the baniſh'd Biſhops, and reſtor'd them to their Sees, and a liberty for the exerciſe of their functions.*

## S E C T. V.

**H**aving shew'd (if I do not mistake) from undoubted mat-  
 ter of fact, that after the Doctrine of one Substance was receiv'd  
 and ratified in the Council of *Nicea*, as that Faith which had  
 remain'd from the beginning, and the Prophets and Evangelists  
 had preach'd, and after the *Arian* Herefie had been confuted and  
 extinguish'd by // those Fathers, *Arianism* was not retriev'd in any  
 one instance, unless by three or four Bishops now and then,  
 upon some emergencies; (who were immediately silenced, and  
 repented, and retracted it) but, tho' suppurated in *St. Hilary's*  
 expression abovemention'd by me, it continu'd almost a conceal'd  
 thing neer thirty years, i. e. from the end of the *Nicene*  
 Council, to the Council of *Sirmium*, the common computation  
 making it little less, and the second *Sirmian* Creed made the first  
 essay for its publication; but the Council of *Ancyra*, and third  
*Sirmian* Creed soon after corrected the mistake of the second,  
 and then above four hundred Bishops anathematiz'd it in the Council  
 of *Ariminum*: Tho the majority, by far, of those Fathers at *Ari-*  
*minum* were so unhappy, to a prodigy, as to retrieve and reestab-

02273:

own party might be augmented, and be thereby be enabled to overthrow the truth. Having also shew'd, that the Catholicks, during the foremention'd interval, contended directly and immediately, if not only, against the deposition of *Arbanasius* and other Bishops, and their unrighteous *Successors*, as unjustly and uncanonically done, by the malice and fraud of the *Eusebians*, who partly wheedled, and partly over rul'd, the Empire by their false suggestions and notorious calumnies, so as it became instrumental to their wish'd purpose, and was the most effectual means for the recovery of their espous'd naughty Heresie, to establish it in the World. It has been made appear too, that *Arbanasius* and his Party suffer'd principally upon this account, daring no more to submit to an unjust Deprivation, and false Succession, than to a false Faith; I should now proceed to something that is behind, but I think fit first to annex the following confectaries, containing a few useful observations and inferences from the whole, which each eye, that hath perus'd it, must have observ'd. As,

I. The *arrogancia*, or ignorance of the plain History and matter of fact, within our interval or prefix'd *Epoche*, is notoriously evident in those, who tell it abroad, that *Arbanasius*, and the then Catholick Bishops, and Believers, did refuse to submit to, and receive, the *Eusebians Abdications* and *Successions*, because the *Successors* were *Arians*. These holy Bishops sagacity, and superadded graces, with which, by the mercy and favour of the heavens, we are to believe them to have been abundantly instructed, must be allow'd to have warn'd and guarded them against the natural and destructive consequences of the *Eusebians* proceedings of that nature, which still made way for the introducing what Heresies the Managers of them design'd to infest the Church of God with: And we have a great deal of reason to believe, that they were especially aware of their Adversaries aim, \* thereby to restore *Arianism*, they having subscrib'd through force, and not sincerely, to its condemnation in the Council of *Nicea*: but yet, since they open'y subscrib'd the *Nicene* Faith in the Council of *Nicea*, and had not renounced and recall'd their subscription by any overt act; but, on the contrary, upon all occasions, in their Synods and Creeds, either openly declar'd for its Doctrine, or palliated it, but made no open remonstrance against it, and neither the *Eusebians* nor *Semi Arians* were † accounted heretical; since themselves did not think they were distinguish'd from the Catholicks by those Creeds which they made, or any other outward performances, within our set compass of time,

\* *Vid. Socrat. l. 1. c. 20. in initio.*

† *August. Ep. 174.*



and therefore made new ones; upon their declaring themselves to be *Arians*, which was done after the aforesaid *Epoche*: Is it not very odd and inconsistent to think and say, that they were then *Arians*, and that their right was not own'd; nor their postestative judicial acts of Government receiv'd as competent, and valid, meerly because of Heresie? Can a more favourable censure be pass'd upon those that maintain this, than that they were ignorant of the state of persons and things within that time? Or can the Catholics, who are suppos'd to have refus'd them, be accounted so unthinking and imprudent as to do it upon that account; since their adversaries might so very easily clear themselves of the aspersions, and invalidate their reason; from their own concessions? For, what was more ready for their reply, then this, *viz.* That their own mouths had acquitted them of it? Might not these *Eusebians* have loaded them back with the guilt of Schism, and Disobedience, upon their non-submission to their *Successors*; if their present *Arianism* had been the only thing they had to plead in their own defence? If therefore the *Eusebians* unjust and uncanonical Deprivations and Possessions did not put the bar, *Athanasius* and his Party will hardly be found justifiable in not submitting to them, since it did not appear, but that in all other respects they were such whose communion no good Catholic could refuse.

2. If we admit the *Eusebians* to have been profess'd *Arians*, within our *Epoche*, or distance of time, how does it follow, that the *Abdications* and *Successions*, which they then created, were rejected by the *Athanasians* as incompetent and invalid, for that reason only? Might there not have been social Reasons that equally oblig'd them to it? It is evident that there were others, and that they were reputed competent, because the *unjustness* and *uncanonicalness* of the *Abdications* and *Successions*, were mostly, if not only, pleaded, as the reasons why they were not receiv'd: I do not remember that the *Successor's* *Arianism* is once directly insisted on, as its reason: but the undue *Abdication* is very frequently: and the Catholics refusing to receive the *Successor* upon the account of the latter, is that which occasions their adversaries objection against them. Besides, may not he that is an *Arian* be a Schismatick too? And is not Schism, in bringing in a false Succession, as much to be separated from, and as just a ground for it, when it is joyn'd with *Arianism*, as it was when the *Novatians* and *Donatists* made it, who were not *Arians*, nor other-

otherways Heretical? St. Paul \* was easily inclinable to believe, \* 1 Cor. 11.  
 hat there were *Schisms* in the Church of *Corinth*, because *there*  
*must be Hereses in it*; but he was far enough from thinking that  
 Schism lost its guilt by being accompanied with Heresie, and that  
 the Believers ought not therefore to avoid, nor have any regard  
 to the Schism; but that it ceas'd, for that reason. Bishops were  
 profess'dly *Arians*, in the days of *Valens* the Emperor, and unjustly  
 posses'd of most of the Sees of *Christendom*, but the Catholics  
 were not less careful and conscientious to keep up the rightful  
 Succession, than the rightful Doctrine, in opposition to them,  
 and the malignity of the Schism oblig'd them to it, as much as  
 the malignity of the Heresie; otherwise the Church was mistaken  
 before, when she reject'd the *Novatians* and *Donatists*. But I  
 have already † shew'd the weakness of Dr. *Hody's* Arguings at  
 this rate, and shall not farther expose them here. † C. 1. Sect. 32.  
 And yet I cannot forbear to add this following recantation, which *Arsenius*  
 made, (who is sti'd *Episcopus Hyspelitarum*, and was the man;  
 whose hand the *Eusebians* pretended to have been cut off by  
*Athanasius*, they bringing him into the open Court to evidence  
 it) upon his discovery of the Plot, which those Children of  
 darkness had laid deep for the destruction of *Athanasius*, and his  
 repentance and reception into the Church: The Recantation  
 ought to be laid up in the Churches *Archives*, as a president in  
 the same, or like case: but I here recite it, as an undeniable in-  
 stance, That it was one part, at least, of Bishop *Arsenius's* guilt;  
 in that he not only concurr'd with the *Eusebians* most impious  
 device, for the taking away *Athanasius's* life, but in that he like-  
 wise joyn'd with them in their most abominable Schism, by  
 breaking the lawful Succession, in turning *Athanasius* wrongfully  
 out of his See, and bringing in a false Bishop, as a *Second*, into  
 his Chair. This is the Sin which he here condoles and recants  
 for by name, and principally, if not solely, repents him of,  
 promising to have no more communion with them in their  
 Schism, but to return to his lawful Metropolitan, as the Laws  
 of the Church require: here is not one word of his joyning  
 with them in the *Arian* Heresie, nor any thing like a retractation  
 on that account: they did not indeed then profess it, but it's  
 contrary: neither may we think the Church would have receiv'd  
*Arsenius* without his retracting it, if he had concurr'd with the  
*Eusebians* in an open profession of it. The Recantation it self is  
 among *Athanasius's* works\*, which I will recite in the *Greek*, and  
 translate into *English*.

\* καὶ ἡμεῖς ἀσπαζόμενοι τὴν εἰρήνην καὶ  
 εὐφροσύνην κατὰ τὴν καθολικὴν ἐκκλησίαν, ὡς  
 οὐ κατὰ κἀκεῖν θεῶν περὶ τὰς, περιηρημένοι  
 τὴν παλαιὰν ἐκκλησιαστικὴν κανὼν κατὰ τὴν πα-  
 ραδόν νόμον ὑποτάσσεται, γράψαντες σοι,  
 ἀγαπῶντες πάπα, ὁμολογῶντες ἐν ὀνόματι  
 κυρίου, τὸ ἀγαπᾶν καὶ κοινωνήσαντες τοῖς ἐπι-  
 σκόποις, καὶ μηδέποτε ἐκκλησιαστικῶν περὶ τὴν  
 καθολικὴν ἐκκλησίαν, ἐπισκόποις τὴν καὶ  
 πρεσβυτέρους καὶ διακόνους, μήτε συνάγειν  
 αὐτοῖς βυλομένους τὴν ἐν συνάδῳ, μήτε  
 γράμματα εἰρηνικὰ ἀποστέλλαντες, μήτε  
 δίδεσθαι παρ' αὐτῶν, μήτε αὐτοῖς δικὰ  
 γράμματα οὐδ' μηδεποτέως ἐπισκόποις ὅσον  
 τίνα ἐκρίβειν περὶ ἐπισκόπων, ἢ περὶ διγ-  
 γλωσσίου ἐπὶ κυρίου ἐκκλησιαστικῶν, ἀλλὰ  
 εἶναι πᾶσι τοῖς περιεσπομένοις κανόσι,  
 καὶ ὁμοῦς ἐπισκόπων Ἀμμωνιανῶν, καὶ  
 τῶν λοιπῶν ἐπισκόπων. *Athanas. Apol. P. 786.*

*We embracing Peace and Unity with  
 the Catholick Church, in which thou dost  
 preside by the grace of God, and having re-  
 solv'd on a full choice to be subject to the old  
 Ecclesiastical Law, write unto thee, most be-  
 loved Bishop, and promise, in the name of the  
 Lord, that we will not, for the future, com-  
 municate with Schismatics, who break the  
 Peace of the Catholick Church, whether they  
 be Bishops, Presbyters, or Deacons, nor unite  
 with them in a Synod, nor send them paci-  
 fick Letters, nor receive any of them, nor  
 make any determination concerning Bishops,  
 or any other common Ecclesiastical Dogma,  
 without the judgment of thee our Metropoli-  
 tan Bishop: but we will give place to all the*

*Canons which have been made and receiv'd according to the example  
 of the Bishops, Ammonianus, Tyrannus, Plupanus, &c.*

If our Adversaries will insist, and say, That *Arsenius* has here omitted his most foul crime, not only in contriving *Athanasius's* death, together with the other *Eusebians*, but in acting so eminent and singular a part in order to it, as he has passed his concern in the *Arian* Heresie over in silence; and as it is sure that he was guilty of the first, tho' it is not here-mention'd, nor its repentance declar'd, so he might be guilty of the Second, and have also repented of it. I thus answer, That as his passing o're the immoralities of the first nature, cannot be an argument that he did not commit them, the contrary being manifest: neither may we believe that the Church did admit him without a repentance for them, tho' it is not here mention'd: So we do not expect that his silence, as to the Heresie, should be lookt upon any more than a probable argument that he was not guilty of it, since he might be, notwithstanding. But nothing is more plain than that he was guilty of the Schism, in being a Party in breaking the rightful Succession, and that the Church did not admit him without a severe repentance, and publick recantation for it: And, if this his recantation for the Schism was not here transmitted to posterity, singly and alone, by design, and the accidents of time, or carelessness of a Copier, had not deprived us of his Recantation for the other: we may safely conclude, the judgment of the then Church, but of *Athanasius* in particular, was, That

That it behov'd all Christians to be satisfied of his recantation of the Schism, and that the common Christianity was concern'd to have it done, for the one as much as for the other.

3. It farther appears, as clear as the Sun at noon-day, That the rejecting a Bishop lawfully possess'd of his Chair, and the receiving an uncanonical Successor upon him, was not accounted an *indifferent thing* in *Athanasius's* time; and that the Church had other Rules in those cases, besides its present outward advantage, tho' a Sovereign Coercive Power had *Abdicated* the Right, and *possess'd* the wrong; since the *Athanasians* did not submit to *Constantius* under such emergencies, but believ'd themselves obliged by the Law of God, to maintain the lawful and canonical Successions, and refuse the contrary; as to maintain the true Faith, and refuse that which is Heretical. Even the *Eusebians* would not receive *Athanasius*, and some other Bishops; tho' the *Sardican* Synod, with the assent of *Constantius* and *Constans*, and what authority they could give to that action, had re-establish'd them in their Sees, because they suppos'd their own preceding Church-Censures, by which they had been depos'd, were just and canonical, and a supervening authority incompetent to rescind them, tho' it were the Empires own: and not only so, but they call'd a Synod in the *East*, and confirm'd those Censures, nay excommunicated *Julius* Bishop of *Rome*, because he had a hand in reversing them. Did not the *Athanasians* undergo more than one persecution, rather than own a false *Succession*, and submit to *Constantius's* imperial Power, which erected it? Was this to consult the outward peace and tranquillity of the Church, before her just Rights and Enfranchisements? Neither may we think so meanly of them, as to believe they would have expos'd themselves to Martyrdom, as they did, rather than comply with *Dr. Hody's Law of Necessity*, in receiving an obtruded false Government, if, as he characterizes it, it was no more than a *sort of* \* Cap. 1. P. 2. *Theological Pedantry*; if they had not known themselves to be antecedently and indispensably oblig'd to the contrary, though they were alone in it, as *Elijah* once was at *Jerusalem*, and *Daniel* and a few more in the Land of *Assyria*; and as *Liberius* declar'd it to be his duty, who was in the like difficulty.

4. We are hence to take notice of the Artifice which these *Eusebians* us'd for the restoring and re-establishing that *Arianism*, which they durst not own and profess, but at the same time protested against it; which was to begin with the Catholick Bishops

Bishops who were most able, and had been most zealous to oppose it, and maintain the contrary Orthodoxy, and representing them as Criminals in other respects, to depose and remove them. Thus fell *Eustathius, Athanasius, Paulus of Constantinople*, and others: then the Tares grew up, and took place, and the whole World became *Arian* upon it. *Athanasius* gives us this account of their proceedings, and appeals to *Constantius* himself, as one that knew full well, that all the Calumnies which were rais'd upon him, were for no other cause, *then to cast us (the Bishops) out of the Churches, and be able thereby to bring in their*

\* *Ἡ ἴνα ἡμῶς οὐκ ἰμπίετ\**. And he farther says; *That their false Council at Tyre was so early conven'd for the same purpose, to overthrow the Council of Nicea, and bring † in their own decrees.* That the method, which they laid for effecting it, was, *taking away the Orthodox Bishops* ||; of which himself, we know, was made an example. This Artifice the more prevail'd, from the severe tryals those Bishops, which stood, were put upon by their Abdication, for sad experience has always shew'd us, that *Flesh and Blood* too often complies under those circumstances: As also from another prejudice the World has lain under, in being brought to believe, that the Offices and Unity of the Church are not so tied to any particular Persons, however circumstantiated, but that they may effectually be executed, and had, under those that uncanonically officiate, and therein openly oppose the establish'd Laws and Unity of the Church, upon the rightful Officer's deprivation, contrary to them.

5. Here we ought to take some notice of another device these artificial Hypocrites made use of, for the restoring and establishing their beloved *Arianism*, which was, by excepting against and omitting, in their Creeds, the manner of explicating the *Eternal Generation*, and *Union* betwixt the *Father* and the *Son*, by the word *Consubstantial*, or the expression of *one Substance*, which the Council of *Nicea* us'd to that purpose: And this they did when they retain'd in their own Creed the same Doctrine with the Council (as the Council it self own'd they did) and subscrib'd to it. One would be very apt to think, and the World is very hardly brought to think otherwise, that since they agreed in the Substance, and the *Eusebians* were acknowledg'd to have come up, even to the explication, in effect, there needed have been no more requir'd of them: For since they assented to the *Eternal Generation*, and that the *Son was made of no other Substance* then that

\* *Ἡ ἴνα ἡμῶς οὐκ ἰμπίετ\**  
 μὴ ἐκβαλλοσὶ  
 τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν,  
 τὴν δὲ ἰδίαν  
 ἀσθενησὶν ἀνθε-  
 σενέγχεον δι-  
 νδῶσι.

Apol. p. 693.  
 † Ibid p 727.  
 || Ἀνελόντες  
 τὴν ὁρθόδοξον.  
 Vid. Ep. ad So-  
 litar. p. 830.



\* Nihil autem  
mirum videri  
vobis debet, fra-  
tres charissimi,  
quod tam fre-  
quenter exponi  
fides suscepta  
sunt: necessita-  
tem hanc furor  
Hæreticus impon-  
nit. De Synod.  
p. 226.

† *Socrat.* l. 2.  
c. 32. *Soz.* l. 4.

|| *Ibid.*

\* *Socrat. ibid.*

† Τὸ εἶναι ὅν-  
των, τὸ κλίσμα,  
τὸ ἐταρῆσιον-  
Theod. N. E.  
l. 2. c. 27. versus  
finem Athanas.  
de Synod. p 911.

niz, &c. which are not found in the Scriptures, nor the Prophetical Writings, nor the Doctrine of the Apostles, be rejected, and driven out of all divine Conventions. And surely upon either of these following terms, as, whether, with the *Eusebians*, men take a liberty to leave the explication of the Church out of their Creeds, and retain the sense of the Council, or whether, with the *Exoukrontians*, they reject it, because the terms of it are not found in the Scriptures, all Church Authority may be waved, and render'd null upon the growing of a party, even Hereticks will not less injure themselves, than they do the Orthodox, upon the latter terms. For those will thereby be equally incapacitated to draw up their own forms, and obtain subscriptions to them, as *Sylvanus* well replied to *Arius*: And he that hath half an eye must have seen what damage the Church of God hath receiv'd by it these last hundred years. All the Controversies, and troubles upon them, which have arose concerning Discipline, have issu'd from it: The disadvantages also which the Ancient Church had by reason of the *former*, are not less manifest from the success of the *Eusebians* upon it, who made themselves by it a party from the *Nicene* Fathers, when at the same time they retain'd the true sense of their Creed, and, in the sequel, they cast out the Creed, and establish'd the rankest *Arianism*, even *Ariomanism*, (in *St. Athanasius's* expression often us'd by him) in its room by its advantage; which wiser men than I believe they could not have compass'd otherwise, but, according to *Socrates*, as he is just now cited, as their Heresie was condemn'd, and wholly silenc'd by the foremention'd holy *Nicene* Fathers, so it never had been retriev'd, nor any more infested the, not only outward peace, but, vitals of Religion, as it did. Some men who have been very free in censuring the same Fathers, because they retain'd the explication, and would not be oblig'd to forego it, do not seem to have fathom'd the whole depth of things, but those who thoroughly think, see their great wisdom and integrity in it.

S E C T V I.

**B**UT, notwithstanding all that hath been said, Doctor *Hody* comes upon us with his full blow, and is well assur'd, that we are not able to support our selves under it: For he tells us \* *That Felix the second Bishop of Rome, who was Orthodox, was in the year ccciv. put into the place of Liberius, an Orthodox Bishop.*

\* The Case of  
the Sees vacant,  
p. 42. and 47.

Bishop of that City, be being depos'd by the Emperor Constantius, and that Liberius was depos'd and banish'd by the bare Authority of the Emperor, without any pretence to a Synod, and that too very unjustly; for no other reason, but because he was Ortbodox, and refus'd to comply with him in subscribing to the condemnation of Athanasius Archbishop of Alexandria, is manifest beyond All doubt, from the testimonies of all Historians : And tho he was made Bishop in the room of the unjustly depriv'd Liberius; yet, first, the Catholick Bishops of his own District communicated with him, and receiv'd him as their Metropolitan. Secondly, his Ordinations were receiv'd, and allow'd of as valid, by, even, his Adversary Liberius. Thirdly, the whole Western Church has all along own'd him as one of the true Bishops of Rome.

And I do not wonder if this stroke does seem, in the eyes of some, to fall heavy upon us, especially in the Doctor's apprehension, ( and some others of his complexion ) who hath abundantly shew'd to the World, that he seldom sees half way, and that it is the surface of an argument, which generally over-rules him : But it can appear no more than a flea-biting to those, that have their eyes in their head. And I question not but that I shall be able to demonstrate to them, that it is no more; but affects the Doctor, not us; if they give themselves their usual freedom in the exercise of their thoughts upon the considerations which here follow, by way of a reply unto him. And in the first place.

1. It is very evident, that the Doctor, and his party, have no advantage from Liberius's practice, in his cession to Felix, and recognition of him as Possessor of the Chair, upon his own unjust Deposition, and Felix's unjust possession, by the Emperor. This (I say) can no ways vouch their most false and pernicious Doctrine, which they have endeavour'd to obtrude upon mankind, viz. That an unlawful Possessor, upon a lay and unjust Deprivation, if he be Ortbodox, may be warrantably receiv'd, and submitted to, be ought to be, by the ejected Bishop, tho' he is every ways Ortbodox, and depriv'd for adhering to the truth, and opposing Vice or Heresie. For all Historians are silent, and give us no account that Liberius receiv'd and submitted to Felix, as Bishop of Rome, or did any thing that can create a Suspicion of it. He submitted to his banishment, to Berea in Thracia with that courage and faith which a good Bishop ought to do : And perhaps none exceeded him under the same circumstances : We may not think that he was ignorant of the pleas which others do use in behalf of their resistance; as, that he was taken from his charge, and those Souls

- over which the Holy Ghost had made him Overseer, in the execution of which he had walked innocently as to God and Man; that his Flock became destitute of his Ministry upon it; that they were left among Wolves and expos'd to their treachery; \* as they complain in their Petition to *Constantius* for his return.
- Theod. H. E. l.* But these topicks were never made use of, in those ages of the Church, to stir up and encourage its Bishops to stand out against the hardest sentence of their lawful Governors: The most righteous cause was not then thought a due bottom for their Justification, in such a case: Of which I have produc'd some instances
- † *C. 1. Sess. 4.* above†: Neither did our *Roman* Pastor return to his See, till he had the Emperor's leave and order for it. And this is all we find of him during his exile, which was two years. There are no footsteps during that time, of his Cession to *Felix*, by Resignation, or otherwaies, or that he submitted and recogniz'd him, or was interpreted to have done it. For Doctor Hody thinks, \* that he needs not any thing to confuse that story, which we find in the two fabulous lives of Pope Damafus, that when Pope *Liberius* was banish'd, he constituted Damafus ( which he surely mistakes for *Felix* ) his Vicar, to supply his place in his absence, and continu'd him till *Liberius* was restored. Tho' whether it was Damafus, or *Felix*, it is alike fabulous, and *Baronius* † counted it so before the Doctor, allowing *Liberius* capable, at the most, but to make a *Chorepiscopus*, whilst himself was alive, because, otherwise, there would be two Bishops at one time in a City. And if we look upon *Liberius* from the time of his return to his Chair at Rome, and reassuming his Episcopal Function, there will not any thing appear, which can probably perswade us to think, that he took any notice of *Felix*, as a Successor there, much less as Co ordinate with him in Power in that District.
- || *H. E. l. 2. c. 17.* Theodorit says, || That he secretly withdrew himself from Rome, and went to another City upon *Liberius's* return. And we have reason to believe him in this affair, rather than any of our other Historians, since it seems plain that he studied it more, and we owe the famous, and useful Dialogue, between *Liberius* and *Constantius*, to his industry and care, which preserv'd it, when all the rest let it slip: save that *Sozomen* \* has a little toucht upon an expression or two in it. *Sozomen* says, || That *Felix* died within a while after, and *Liberius* govern'd alone, the Providence of God so ordering it, that two Bishops should not preside at once in *St. Peter's* See, to its manifest dishonour, it being a note of discord, and
- contrary

\* *Tuſis* τὸν αὐ-  
τον ἐπιβουλεύ-  
*Theod. H. E. l.*  
2. c. 17.

\* P. 47, & 54.  
Case of the Sees  
vacant.

† *An. 355. num.*  
58.

\* *L. 4. c. 10.*

|| *Ibid. c. 14.*

Contrary to the Laws of the Church. From whence, if we do infer, as the words may direct us, that they govern'd together until *Felix's* death, it is apparent that they did not do it in an amicable conjunction, but in opposition to one another; otherwise it wou'd have been no more to the infamy of that City, then it was when *St. Peter* and *St. Paul* presided there at the same time. *Faustinus* and *Marcellinus* say \*, that he liv'd eight years after. But what if he did live so long, or but a third part of that time, or less; \* *Presat. ad libel. praxini.* and *Liberius* accepted of the terms which *Constantius*, and the Bishops, then congregated at *Sirmium*, offer'd unto him, viz. That *Felix* and the Clergy of Rome should receive him, and both Officiate there amicably, and in common, and those dismal things which happen'd upon *Felix's* Election, as also *Liberius's* banishment, should be forgotten? Even this does no ways imply, that *Felix* was receiv'd as a Successor and Intruder; but the contrary: For, it was to be done upon a new composition; and *Liberius* must first have made a cession, and then deriv'd on *Felix* so much of his Power, as would place him in a Co ordination with himself; by virtue of which, and not of his Possession, his right could come. But after all, this was never done: For, the people unanimously refus'd the thing, and cried out with one voice, \* *one God, one Christ, one Bishop!* Whence we may also learn, that the Empire's Authority was not by them thought sufficient to give a Rule, by virtue of which, the first Church Law, which requires one Bishop only in a City, seem'd to be violated. Again, if Orthodoxy alone, tho in wrong, to all other Church-Laws, does legitimate a Possessor, it does not appear, that the Believers in the Roman Church, at that time, were aware of it. And yet two Bishops in that Apostolical Chair, if justly placed there, would neither have dishonour'd the See, nor oppos'd the Church Laws, as I have just now intimated, and farther exemplified above, † in *Meletius's* and *Paulinus's* cases at *Antioch*, which was some time after in our Church Annals. † *Cap. 1. Sc. 4.*

In short, (for this head of our discourse has grown a little too much upon us) this great man, Bishop *Liberius*, and Victorious Defender of the Truth, as *Theodoret* justly calls him †, was so † *Nixapoc & Andrias a- p. 12. c. 17.* unhappy, as to offer violence to his own knowledge and conscience, and deepest sense of duty to the contrary, in that he contradicted (in the worst manner, because it was by his practice) his own receiv'd principle of unity, built on a sure foundation, by \* subscribing to *Athanasius's* unjust and uncanonical † *Athens. E. ad Salm. p. 83.*

Deprecation,



*Deprecation*, when he had refus'd, and oppos'd it to the Emperor's face, with the greatest courage and Christian fortitude, choosing rather to be an exile, and without house and home, nay, even death it self, if the pleasure of *Constantius*, which lay'd the first upon him, had thought fit to condemn him to the latter, this great Man ( I say ) thus [scowly] fell, upon the poor motives of riches and honour \* ( which he had so generously despis'd two years together ) to the amazement of mankind and great dishonour to his Station and Order. But God's Grace so far prevented him, that he did not improve the transgression so very scandalously, as Dr. Hody thinks he might lawfully and warrantably have done, and recognize *Felix*, and give countenance thereby and authority to the Doctor's most pernicious Doctrine, viz. That where a Successor is placed in the See of a Bishop that is unjustly and uncanonically depos'd, so it be done by a Sovereign Coercive, or otherwaies irresistible, power, there the Successor may be acknowledg'd, if he be Orthodox.

2. As we have no ground upon which we may probably persuade our selves, that *Liberius* submitted to, and recogniz'd *Felix*, as a Successor, either during his banishment, or after his return to Rome, so we have it most surely deliver'd unto us, that the Believers in Rome, at least a very considerable part of them, did not receive and communicate with *Felix* as their Bishop, but recogniz'd and adher'd to *Liberius* all along, even under his banishment and deprivation. For what less can be the importance of that which *Theodorit* relates of them †, when he says, *That the Wives of the Magistrates and Nobility in Rome plainly told their Husbands, that if Liberius was not restor'd to his Flock, they would leave them, and fly away to him their great Pastor*. What other motive but a deep sense of their duty, and indefeasible dependance upon him, as their continu'd and proper Bishop, tho' absent in his person, could advise them to such resolutions and methods? Or can we believe them to have so learn'd *Christ*, as to make an offer of leaving their Husbands and Families, and think it was warrantable upon a lower consideration? And any thing less, then that which they apprehended to be their duty in a very high degree, would justify them in it? And we have no reason to look upon this as the effect only of womanish zeal, since their Husbands, the *Magistrates* and *Nobility*, do not only not contradict, nor countermand them in it; but they are represented, by our Historian ‖, to approve of their zeal and resolution so far, as

\* Qui biennio postea, recuperanda sedis amore, Athanasii condemnationem subscripsit. Petav. Rationarii temporis par. 1. l. 6.

† L. 2. c. 17.

‖ Theod. ibid. supra.

that when their Wives ask'd their leave, that they might petition *Constantius* ( he being then at *Rome* ) for *Liberius's* return ; they not only granted their request, but declar'd that themselves were ready to have done it in their own persons, and that they forbore, as being more lyable to the Emperor's wrath, if it was resent'd amiss, tho' it was nothing but worldly policy, which is a too common bar to holy and just performances, which prevented them : and their answer is set down to this effect *They, said that they fear'd the wrath of the King, and being men, he possibly might not pardon them, but they ( i. e. their Wives ) would obtain mercy, and one of these two be its consequent, either he will grant their supplication, or send them peaceable away.* These men and women, and the most considerable of the people in *Rome*, being afterwards, upon farther considerations, united as one man, ( interpretatively, if not in their persons ) and supplicating the Emperor, the words and matter of their Petition abundantly, and unexceptionably farther declare, That they neither had, nor own'd, any other Bishop than *Liberius*, but rejected *Felix* at the same time and did not communicate with him : For they supplicate him, † *That he would have pity upon so great a City depriv'd of its Pastor, and made thereby a prey to the treachery of Wolves.* And what do they else but remonstrate unto him, that their City is without a Bishop, tho' *Felix*, at the same time, was an actual Possessor among them, made such by a Sovereign Coercive hand? Could they have more effectually renounced *Felix*; then they have done in these words? If he had been their Bishop, why did they not direct their request to him for their rescue from the Wolves that invaded them? Especially since he was Orthodox in his Faith, and no bar lay against him in that respect. The Catholick Principles which they profess'd, had he been their lawful Bishop, would have directed them to it: Neither may we think, that they petition'd *Constantius* upon *Felix's* remissness in his duty, by reason of which it was that the Wolves broke in upon them, that he would extend his Royal Arm for their assistance, ( tho' the Catholick's Faith would have bore them out in the doing of it ) since their actual want of a Bishop to reside among them, upon *Liberius's* exile, and their longing desire to have him restor'd, was the ground and occasion of their Petition.

Our Historian adds † *That none of the Inhabitants of Rome would come to prayers, whilst Felix was in the Church: And tho' they seem'd* <sup>\* Ibid.</sup> <sup>† See another copy</sup>

at first to hearken to the Emperor's proposal, upon his permission that Liberius should return, viz. That he and Felix should govern together, yet, upon second thoughts, they corrected themselves, and with one common voice cried out, one God, one Christ, one Bishop, founded upon a first common Church principle, which requires but one Bishop to be in a City : Upon this just and pious demand, Liberius came back ; but Felix withdrew privately, and went to another City. Socrates\* says, that the People at Rome rose and cast him out of the City, and that the Emperor was forced to comply with them. Sozomen† adds, that, πολλοὶ ἄνθρωποι, a multitude requir'd Liberius, with a great clamor ; that the Bishops of Felix's party and the Emperor consulted together, and order'd his return ; that Felix ‖ died presently after, and Liberius govern'd alone ; the special Providence of God so disposing it, that the Seat of St. Peter should not be assersed with the calumny of being govern'd by two Bishops, it being a mark of division, and contrary to the Laws of the Church. Now, though these three famous Historians differ somewhat in their Relations, they all agree, that the people, or Believers, in Rome did not receive Felix either before Liberius's return, or after it. Sozomen alone, seems to intimate, that some of the Clergy of the City adher'd to him.

3. Doctor Hody may easily be observ'd to catch at the two presbyters, *Faustinus* and *Marcellinus*, upon every occasion, and improve their Authority for the advantage of his cause : Tho' a man would wonder at it, if he wonders at any thing in him, since the two Schismatical Presbyters, is the usual Epitaph he bestows upon them : besides other remarques, that much lessen them. But he particularly says of them, that, *whatsoever their Authority may be, it deserves not at all to be regarded, since what they write is directly against Damasus, who was one of that party : And since when they wrote, they were Schismatics, and had never regard to the peace, and tranquility of the Church : Surely their Libellus precum* which they offer'd to *Valentinian*, *Theodosius*, and *Arcadius*, indicates them to be men of excellent spirits in many things, but especially in their renunciation of the world, and its outwards advantages, when it came in competition with that which they believed to be their duty. It is the want of the same spirit which hath mostly, all along, ruin'd the Church of God, and never more then in days of *Constantius* and *Valens*, during whose persecutions, the generality of the Bishops, that were, in their own Inclinations, good and honest men, chang'd their Faith, as they were in danger to lose their Bishopricks, upon an open propeffion of it. I

with

\* L. 2. c. 29.

† L. 4. c. 10.

‖ *Ibid.* cap. 14.

\* P. 53.

with our modern Ages had given us less pregnant instances of the like recidivations. Neither can I forbear saying, that my pressing thoughts concerning them have some times occasion'd me to wish, with those two Presbyters, that the Church had no revenues, but was, at this day, in the same naked condition our Saviour and the Apostles left her, and first planted her. It must be own'd, that these two zealous Men, tho' they did not too deeply resent these things, (for that cannot be done) drew undue consequences from them, and carried themselves into the *Luciferian* mistake. Because it is a firm truth, that we may not communicate with a Bishop in his *Arianism*, they thence concluded, that we may not, either, communicate with him upon his repentance, and that his fall is not recoverable, by his giving satisfaction, but he is to be finally driven from the Altar. They must be, likewise, own'd to have managed this mistake with too great an allay of that Gospel spirit, which is, at other times, visibly discernible to be more pure, and less mixed, in them, but, their integrity, as Historians, seems to be justly questionable, from the account which they give of the great and eminently renowned *Hosius*, whose fall all men have lamented, but excus'd at the same time his infirmity: But they, more popularly to aggravate the *Eusebians* injustice, (which they could not do too much, in the ways of truth) make him an eminent Actor in it, and say, that, instead of repenting for his fall, he took a Commission from *Constantius*, and sat Judge on the Bench; and that his impious Proceedings, and Censure, against *Gregory*, Bishop of *Emesa*, immediatly call'd for vengeance from Heaven, that he was struck speechless, and expired on the place. But, I say, their Authority here seems very little, because they are *primi & soli*, the first, and only men, that have said it. And there are not only no footsteps in History of it, but all Histories have said the contrary.

† *Libel. precum.*  
P. 14.

But, whatever the Authority of these two Presbyters, *Faustinus* and *Marcellinus*, was in other instances, (it must be own'd to be passable in some, though the Doctor, some times, will not allow it) since the Doctor has thought fit to make use of it, so far as he apprehends it to serve his turn, I shall make use of it also, so far as it evidently serves mine. And,

1. They tell || us, that, Upon *Liberius's* exile, the Clergy of Rome were so far from the Doctors thoughts, viz. that a Secular Proscription makes way for a Successor, that the very day, in which he was banish'd

|| *Prefat. ad Libellum.*

banish'd and left them, they all, i. e. the Presbyters and Archdeacon Felix, and even Damasus the Deacon, and all the Officers of the Church, went as one man, the People being present, and oblig'd themselves by oath, that, so long as Liberius lived, they would, at no hand, have another Bishop. Our other Historians have abundantly acquainted us with the zeal of the people for him, i. e. the Believers only. But leave some ground for us to suspect, that the Clergy might have come short of them, and have been less active in his behalf: But this doubt is wholly remov'd by this account from our two Presbyters, and they let us know, that the Clergy no ways came behind them, once at least, tho' they fell off from him a little after.

*Ibid.*

2. They farther tells us, that, it was Damasus's corruption through ambition (*ambitione corruptus*) which, afterwards turn'd him aside from doing his duty to Liberius, as he was his Deacon: And, when he had accompanied him seven miles from Rome, prevail'd with him

*Contra fas: quod minime decet: after, obtain'd to have Archdeacon Felix, ordain'd, and receiv'd him cum summo per-jurii scelere civil, and deeply perjur'd in doing of it, but it was illegally done, quod factum u-niverso populo displicuit et se displeased at it, and refused to be present during the solemnity: It ab ejus processione suspendit.*

to desert him: Also, that when he, and the rest of the Clergy, a little after, obtain'd to have Archdeacon Felix, ordain'd, and receiv'd him as their Bishop in Liberius's room, they were, not only rude and un-jur'd, but civil, and deeply perjur'd in doing of it, but it was illegally done, against the Laws of God, and the Church: and that all the people were displeased at it, and refused to be present during the solemnity: It seems the people of Rome, at this time of day, were better Christians than their Guides: And tho' they were not obliged to Liberius by oath, as the Clergy were, they our went them in the continuance of their duty to him, as their proper and lawful Bishop. It would be a detraction from their integrity to say, that these Lay-Believers had no Bishopricks, nor Spiritualities, to lose, as the Clergy had: And that is the reason why they did not comply, as the Clergy did, but kept to their duties of spiritual Allegiance; when their Captains so shamefully deserted; nay acted contrary to it. But I heartily wish that there were less pregnant reasons producible, and obliging me to think, that the Clergy had never complied with Constantius, nor enthroned Felix, if they had not well known that he otherwise, would take their temporalities from them.

3. The same Preface informs us moreover, that these Lay-Believers not only rejected Felix, but, petition'd Constantius for Liberius's return, and, that, upon the Imperial Grant of their Request, they met him without the City, and joyfully introduced him: The Clergy are not mention'd here neither, but on the contrary, we are told,



bold, that when Felix had been cast out of the City by the Senate, the same perjur'd Clergy brought him back, but the whole number of Believers, and the Nobility, cast him out again, with great disgrace; and that they continued firm in their duty to Liberius until his death, and his Throne was voided, upon the terms that the Church allows, tho' they were, at least, some of them, so unhappy as, when he died, to elect *Ursicinus* in his Chair, against *Damasus*, and there was a short Schism upon it. But this Election was carried not with design to invade the Laws of the Church so as to plead the Right of the Empire against the Church in it, and Doctor *Hody* and his friends will have no advantage by it. *Damasus* was no less unfortunate in the management of his rightful title against *Ursicinus*, it being done, not only in a tumultuous way, but in spilling of blood, of which we have account in our other Historians\* as well as in our Pre-  
 face : Tho' *Socrates* and *Sozomen* make *Ursicinus*, and his party, the occasion of it : And, perhaps the two Presbyters may be over partial in their own cause, in laying it upon *Damasus*. But my purpose is not to vindicate them as Historians, but to make it appear, ( which, if I mistake not, I have abundantly done ) that all the authority they have is full against the Doctor, notwithstanding he has taken so great pains to have the World think otherways. I now go on to my following Observations; as.

4. It will farther appear to any considering person from the practice of *Liberius*, and the Believers at *Rome*, even of the Clergy until worldly fear and ambition corrupted them, that, a Bishops forcible absence was not then believed to make way for a Successor, tho' he was Orthodox : For, it is very plain, that *Liberius* was forcibly sent into *Thrace*, and Orthodox *Felix*, was in his Throne, but *Liberius* did not submit to him, nor the Christians in common, but the latter openly declar'd, that if he might not be restor'd, *convoluturos*, ( as *Chistoforsen* translates it ) they would || fly together to him their great Pastor. So vastly distant are the thoughts of these Ancient Christians, in this case, from those which some have entertain'd at this day in the like juncture, who plead the forcible removal of their Bishops, as sufficient to justify their submission to those call'd their Successors, though they are not sent away near so far from them, as *Italy* and *Thrace* are from one another.

\* *Socrat. l. 4. c. 24. Soz. l. 6. c. 22*

† *Theod. l. 2. c. 27.*

|| *Theod. ibid. l. 1. c. 1. § 1. 1165 & 1175. 1176 & 1177. 1178 & 1179. 1180 & 1181. 1182 & 1183. 1184 & 1185. 1186 & 1187. 1188 & 1189. 1190 & 1191. 1192 & 1193. 1194 & 1195. 1196 & 1197. 1198 & 1199. 1200 & 1201. 1202 & 1203. 1204 & 1205. 1206 & 1207. 1208 & 1209. 1210 & 1211. 1212 & 1213. 1214 & 1215. 1216 & 1217. 1218 & 1219. 1220 & 1221. 1222 & 1223. 1224 & 1225. 1226 & 1227. 1228 & 1229. 1230 & 1231. 1232 & 1233. 1234 & 1235. 1236 & 1237. 1238 & 1239. 1240 & 1241. 1242 & 1243. 1244 & 1245. 1246 & 1247. 1248 & 1249. 1250 & 1251. 1252 & 1253. 1254 & 1255. 1256 & 1257. 1258 & 1259. 1260 & 1261. 1262 & 1263. 1264 & 1265. 1266 & 1267. 1268 & 1269. 1270 & 1271. 1272 & 1273. 1274 & 1275. 1276 & 1277. 1278 & 1279. 1280 & 1281. 1282 & 1283. 1284 & 1285. 1286 & 1287. 1288 & 1289. 1290 & 1291. 1292 & 1293. 1294 & 1295. 1296 & 1297. 1298 & 1299. 1300 & 1301. 1302 & 1303. 1304 & 1305. 1306 & 1307. 1308 & 1309. 1310 & 1311. 1312 & 1313. 1314 & 1315. 1316 & 1317. 1318 & 1319. 1320 & 1321. 1322 & 1323. 1324 & 1325. 1326 & 1327. 1328 & 1329. 1330 & 1331. 1332 & 1333. 1334 & 1335. 1336 & 1337. 1338 & 1339. 1340 & 1341. 1342 & 1343. 1344 & 1345. 1346 & 1347. 1348 & 1349. 1350 & 1351. 1352 & 1353. 1354 & 1355. 1356 & 1357. 1358 & 1359. 1360 & 1361. 1362 & 1363. 1364 & 1365. 1366 & 1367. 1368 & 1369. 1370 & 1371. 1372 & 1373. 1374 & 1375. 1376 & 1377. 1378 & 1379. 1380 & 1381. 1382 & 1383. 1384 & 1385. 1386 & 1387. 1388 & 1389. 1390 & 1391. 1392 & 1393. 1394 & 1395. 1396 & 1397. 1398 & 1399. 1400 & 1401. 1402 & 1403. 1404 & 1405. 1406 & 1407. 1408 & 1409. 1410 & 1411. 1412 & 1413. 1414 & 1415. 1416 & 1417. 1418 & 1419. 1420 & 1421. 1422 & 1423. 1424 & 1425. 1426 & 1427. 1428 & 1429. 1430 & 1431. 1432 & 1433. 1434 & 1435. 1436 & 1437. 1438 & 1439. 1440 & 1441. 1442 & 1443. 1444 & 1445. 1446 & 1447. 1448 & 1449. 1450 & 1451. 1452 & 1453. 1454 & 1455. 1456 & 1457. 1458 & 1459. 1460 & 1461. 1462 & 1463. 1464 & 1465. 1466 & 1467. 1468 & 1469. 1470 & 1471. 1472 & 1473. 1474 & 1475. 1476 & 1477. 1478 & 1479. 1480 & 1481. 1482 & 1483. 1484 & 1485. 1486 & 1487. 1488 & 1489. 1490 & 1491. 1492 & 1493. 1494 & 1495. 1496 & 1497. 1498 & 1499. 1500 & 1501. 1502 & 1503. 1504 & 1505. 1506 & 1507. 1508 & 1509. 1510 & 1511. 1512 & 1513. 1514 & 1515. 1516 & 1517. 1518 & 1519. 1520 & 1521. 1522 & 1523. 1524 & 1525. 1526 & 1527. 1528 & 1529. 1530 & 1531. 1532 & 1533. 1534 & 1535. 1536 & 1537. 1538 & 1539. 1540 & 1541. 1542 & 1543. 1544 & 1545. 1546 & 1547. 1548 & 1549. 1550 & 1551. 1552 & 1553. 1554 & 1555. 1556 & 1557. 1558 & 1559. 1560 & 1561. 1562 & 1563. 1564 & 1565. 1566 & 1567. 1568 & 1569. 1570 & 1571. 1572 & 1573. 1574 & 1575. 1576 & 1577. 1578 & 1579. 1580 & 1581. 1582 & 1583. 1584 & 1585. 1586 & 1587. 1588 & 1589. 1590 & 1591. 1592 & 1593. 1594 & 1595. 1596 & 1597. 1598 & 1599. 1600 & 1601. 1602 & 1603. 1604 & 1605. 1606 & 1607. 1608 & 1609. 1610 & 1611. 1612 & 1613. 1614 & 1615. 1616 & 1617. 1618 & 1619. 1620 & 1621. 1622 & 1623. 1624 & 1625. 1626 & 1627. 1628 & 1629. 1630 & 1631. 1632 & 1633. 1634 & 1635. 1636 & 1637. 1638 & 1639. 1640 & 1641. 1642 & 1643. 1644 & 1645. 1646 & 1647. 1648 & 1649. 1650 & 1651. 1652 & 1653. 1654 & 1655. 1656 & 1657. 1658 & 1659. 1660 & 1661. 1662 & 1663. 1664 & 1665. 1666 & 1667. 1668 & 1669. 1670 & 1671. 1672 & 1673. 1674 & 1675. 1676 & 1677. 1678 & 1679. 1680 & 1681. 1682 & 1683. 1684 & 1685. 1686 & 1687. 1688 & 1689. 1690 & 1691. 1692 & 1693. 1694 & 1695. 1696 & 1697. 1698 & 1699. 1700 & 1701. 1702 & 1703. 1704 & 1705. 1706 & 1707. 1708 & 1709. 1710 & 1711. 1712 & 1713. 1714 & 1715. 1716 & 1717. 1718 & 1719. 1720 & 1721. 1722 & 1723. 1724 & 1725. 1726 & 1727. 1728 & 1729. 1730 & 1731. 1732 & 1733. 1734 & 1735. 1736 & 1737. 1738 & 1739. 1740 & 1741. 1742 & 1743. 1744 & 1745. 1746 & 1747. 1748 & 1749. 1750 & 1751. 1752 & 1753. 1754 & 1755. 1756 & 1757. 1758 & 1759. 1760 & 1761. 1762 & 1763. 1764 & 1765. 1766 & 1767. 1768 & 1769. 1770 & 1771. 1772 & 1773. 1774 & 1775. 1776 & 1777. 1778 & 1779. 1780 & 1781. 1782 & 1783. 1784 & 1785. 1786 & 1787. 1788 & 1789. 1790 & 1791. 1792 & 1793. 1794 & 1795. 1796 & 1797. 1798 & 1799. 1800 & 1801. 1802 & 1803. 1804 & 1805. 1806 & 1807. 1808 & 1809. 1810 & 1811. 1812 & 1813. 1814 & 1815. 1816 & 1817. 1818 & 1819. 1820 & 1821. 1822 & 1823. 1824 & 1825. 1826 & 1827. 1828 & 1829. 1830 & 1831. 1832 & 1833. 1834 & 1835. 1836 & 1837. 1838 & 1839. 1840 & 1841. 1842 & 1843. 1844 & 1845. 1846 & 1847. 1848 & 1849. 1850 & 1851. 1852 & 1853. 1854 & 1855. 1856 & 1857. 1858 & 1859. 1860 & 1861. 1862 & 1863. 1864 & 1865. 1866 & 1867. 1868 & 1869. 1870 & 1871. 1872 & 1873. 1874 & 1875. 1876 & 1877. 1878 & 1879. 1880 & 1881. 1882 & 1883. 1884 & 1885. 1886 & 1887. 1888 & 1889. 1890 & 1891. 1892 & 1893. 1894 & 1895. 1896 & 1897. 1898 & 1899. 1900 & 1901. 1902 & 1903. 1904 & 1905. 1906 & 1907. 1908 & 1909. 1910 & 1911. 1912 & 1913. 1914 & 1915. 1916 & 1917. 1918 & 1919. 1920 & 1921. 1922 & 1923. 1924 & 1925. 1926 & 1927. 1928 & 1929. 1930 & 1931. 1932 & 1933. 1934 & 1935. 1936 & 1937. 1938 & 1939. 1940 & 1941. 1942 & 1943. 1944 & 1945. 1946 & 1947. 1948 & 1949. 1950 & 1951. 1952 & 1953. 1954 & 1955. 1956 & 1957. 1958 & 1959. 1960 & 1961. 1962 & 1963. 1964 & 1965. 1966 & 1967. 1968 & 1969. 1970 & 1971. 1972 & 1973. 1974 & 1975. 1976 & 1977. 1978 & 1979. 1980 & 1981. 1982 & 1983. 1984 & 1985. 1986 & 1987. 1988 & 1989. 1990 & 1991. 1992 & 1993. 1994 & 1995. 1996 & 1997. 1998 & 1999. 2000 & 2001. 2002 & 2003. 2004 & 2005. 2006 & 2007. 2008 & 2009. 2010 & 2011. 2012 & 2013. 2014 & 2015. 2016 & 2017. 2018 & 2019. 2020 & 2021. 2022 & 2023. 2024 & 2025. 2026 & 2027. 2028 & 2029. 2030 & 2031. 2032 & 2033. 2034 & 2035. 2036 & 2037. 2038 & 2039. 2040 & 2041. 2042 & 2043. 2044 & 2045. 2046 & 2047. 2048 & 2049. 2050 & 2051. 2052 & 2053. 2054 & 2055. 2056 & 2057. 2058 & 2059. 2060 & 2061. 2062 & 2063. 2064 & 2065. 2066 & 2067. 2068 & 2069. 2070 & 2071. 2072 & 2073. 2074 & 2075. 2076 & 2077. 2078 & 2079. 2080 & 2081. 2082 & 2083. 2084 & 2085. 2086 & 2087. 2088 & 2089. 2090 & 2091. 2092 & 2093. 2094 & 2095. 2096 & 2097. 2098 & 2099. 2100 & 2101. 2102 & 2103. 2104 & 2105. 2106 & 2107. 2108 & 2109. 2110 & 2111. 2112 & 2113. 2114 & 2115. 2116 & 2117. 2118 & 2119. 2120 & 2121. 2122 & 2123. 2124 & 2125. 2126 & 2127. 2128 & 2129. 2130 & 2131. 2132 & 2133. 2134 & 2135. 2136 & 2137. 2138 & 2139. 2140 & 2141. 2142 & 2143. 2144 & 2145. 2146 & 2147. 2148 & 2149. 2150 & 2151. 2152 & 2153. 2154 & 2155. 2156 & 2157. 2158 & 2159. 2160 & 2161. 2162 & 2163. 2164 & 2165. 2166 & 2167. 2168 & 2169. 2170 & 2171. 2172 & 2173. 2174 & 2175. 2176 & 2177. 2178 & 2179. 2180 & 2181. 2182 & 2183. 2184 & 2185. 2186 & 2187. 2188 & 2189. 2190 & 2191. 2192 & 2193. 2194 & 2195. 2196 & 2197. 2198 & 2199. 2200 & 2201. 2202 & 2203. 2204 & 2205. 2206 & 2207. 2208 & 2209. 2210 & 2211. 2212 & 2213. 2214 & 2215. 2216 & 2217. 2218 & 2219. 2220 & 2221. 2222 & 2223. 2224 & 2225. 2226 & 2227. 2228 & 2229. 2230 & 2231. 2232 & 2233. 2234 & 2235. 2236 & 2237. 2238 & 2239. 2240 & 2241. 2242 & 2243. 2244 & 2245. 2246 & 2247. 2248 & 2249. 2250 & 2251. 2252 & 2253. 2254 & 2255. 2256 & 2257. 2258 & 2259. 2260 & 2261. 2262 & 2263. 2264 & 2265. 2266 & 2267. 2268 & 2269. 2270 & 2271. 2272 & 2273. 2274 & 2275. 2276 & 2277. 2278 & 2279. 2280 & 2281. 2282 & 2283. 2284 & 2285. 2286 & 2287. 2288 & 2289. 2290 & 2291. 2292 & 2293. 2294 & 2295. 2296 & 2297. 2298 & 2299. 2300 & 2301. 2302 & 2303. 2304 & 2305. 2306 & 2307. 2308 & 2309. 2310 & 2311. 2312 & 2313. 2314 & 2315. 2316 & 2317. 2318 & 2319. 2320 & 2321. 2322 & 2323. 2324 & 2325. 2326 & 2327. 2328 & 2329. 2330 & 2331. 2332 & 2333. 2334 & 2335. 2336 & 2337. 2338 & 2339. 2340 & 2341. 2342 & 2343. 2344 & 2345. 2346 & 2347. 2348 & 2349. 2350 & 2351. 2352 & 2353. 2354 & 2355. 2356 & 2357. 2358 & 2359. 2360 & 2361. 2362 & 2363. 2364 & 2365. 2366 & 2367. 2368 & 2369. 2370 & 2371. 2372 & 2373. 2374 & 2375. 2376 & 2377. 2378 & 2379. 2380 & 2381. 2382 & 2383. 2384 & 2385. 2386 & 2387. 2388 & 2389. 2390 & 2391. 2392 & 2393. 2394 & 2395. 2396 & 2397. 2398 & 2399. 2400 & 2401. 2402 & 2403. 2404 & 2405. 2406 & 2407. 2408 & 2409. 2410 & 2411. 2412 & 2413. 2414 & 2415. 2416 & 2417. 2418 & 2419. 2420 & 2421. 2422 & 2423. 2424 & 2425. 2426 & 2427. 2428 & 2429. 2430 & 2431. 2432 & 2433. 2434 & 2435. 2436 & 2437. 2438 & 2439. 2440 & 2441. 2442 & 2443. 2444 & 2445. 2446 & 2447. 2448 & 2449. 2450 & 2451. 2452 & 2453. 2454 & 2455. 2456 & 2457. 2458 & 2459. 2460 & 2461. 2462 & 2463. 2464 & 2465. 2466 & 2467. 2468 & 2469. 2470 & 2471. 2472 & 2473. 2474 & 2475. 2476 & 2477. 2478 & 2479. 2480 & 2481. 2482 & 2483. 2484 & 2485. 2486 & 2487. 2488 & 2489. 2490 & 2491. 2492 & 2493. 2494 & 2495. 2496 & 2497. 2498 & 2499. 2500 & 2501. 2502 & 2503. 2504 & 2505. 2506 & 2507. 2508 & 2509. 2510 & 2511. 2512 & 2513. 2514 & 2515. 2516 & 2517. 2518 & 2519. 2520 & 2521. 2522 & 2523. 2524 & 2525. 2526 & 2527. 2528 & 2529. 2530 & 2531. 2532 & 2533. 2534 & 2535. 2536 & 2537. 2538 & 2539. 2540 & 2541. 2542 & 2543. 2544 & 2545. 2546 & 2547. 2548 & 2549. 2550 & 2551. 2552 & 2553. 2554 & 2555. 2556 & 2557. 2558 & 2559. 2560 & 2561. 2562 & 2563. 2564 & 2565. 2566 & 2567. 2568 & 2569. 2570 & 2571. 2572 & 2573. 2574 & 2575. 2576 & 2577. 2578 & 2579. 2580 & 2581. 2582 & 2583. 2584 & 2585. 2586 & 2587. 2588 & 2589. 2590 & 2591. 2592 & 2593. 2594 & 2595. 2596 & 2597. 2598 & 2599. 2600 & 2601. 2602 & 2603. 2604 & 2605. 2606 & 2607. 2608 & 2609. 2610 & 2611. 2612 & 2613. 2614 & 2615. 2616 & 2617. 2618 & 2619. 2620 & 2621. 2622 & 2623. 2624 & 2625. 2626 & 2627. 2628 & 2629. 2630 & 2631. 2632 & 2633. 2634 & 2635. 2636 & 2637. 2638 & 2639. 2640 & 2641. 2642 & 2643. 2644 & 2645. 2646 & 2647. 2648 & 2649. 2650 & 2651. 2652 & 2653. 2654 & 2655. 2656 & 2657. 2658 & 2659. 2660 & 2661. 2662 & 2663. 2664 & 2665. 2666 & 2667. 2668 & 2669. 2670 & 2671. 2672 & 2673. 2674 & 2675. 2676 & 2677. 2678 & 2679. 2680 & 2681. 2682 & 2683. 2684 & 2685. 2686 & 2687. 2688 & 2689. 2690 & 2691. 2692 & 2693. 2694 & 2695. 2696 & 2697. 2698 & 2699. 2700 & 2701. 2702 & 2703. 2704 & 2705. 2706 & 2707. 2708 & 2709. 2710 & 2711. 2712 & 2713. 2714 & 2715. 2716 & 2717. 2718 & 2719. 2720 & 2721. 2722 & 2723. 2724 & 2725. 2726 & 2727. 2728 & 2729. 2730 & 2731. 2732 & 2733. 2734 & 2735. 2736 & 2737. 2738 & 2739. 2740 & 2741. 2742 & 2743. 2744 & 2745. 2746 & 2747. 2748 & 2749. 2750 & 2751. 2752 & 2753. 2754 & 2755. 2756 & 2757. 2758 & 2759. 2760 & 2761. 2762 & 2763. 2764 & 2765. 2766 & 2767. 2768 & 2769. 2770 & 2771. 2772 & 2773. 2774 & 2775. 2776 & 2777. 2778 & 2779. 2780 & 2781. 2782 & 2783. 2784 & 2785. 2786 & 2787. 2788 & 2789. 2790 & 2791. 2792 & 2793. 2794 & 2795. 2796 & 2797. 2798 & 2799. 2800 & 2801. 2802 & 2803. 2804 & 2805.*

5. It is no less evident from the Circumstances of our present case, that the Prince's acceptance and confirmation of a *Successor*; whom the Clergy have placed in a See, whose Bishop is forcibly absent, or the Prince's possessing him, in his own Right, even the Bishops concurring, were not thought sufficient to legitimate his Possession, and justify the Subject Believers, that receive and obey him, by virtue of it. For \* *Theodorit* and † *Sozomen* tells us, that, though the Emperor first argued with the People of *Rome* concerning *Felix*, and recommended him unto them as the present Bishop, and every ways able to guide and govern them, and afterwards commanded them to receive him, and the Bishops that were, then, congregated at *Sirminum* did the same, yet, both their Rights and Authorities were concluded incompetent, and refused, because they brought in *Felix*, and endeavoured to settle him, in a See that was full, by the Laws of the Church.

Once more ; it is also hence evident, that, as professed Heresie, and *Arianism* in particular, was then reputed one just ground for the refusal of a Bishop, and not holding communion with him, if Heresie be made the Terms of it, so profess'd Schism was reputed another, and it was not then judged lawful to hold communion with a false Succession of Bishops, or with those that Schismatically communicated with them. This was the plain case of the People of *Rome* and *Felix*, whom || *Theodorit* and *Sozomen* represent to have retain'd the *Nicene Faith* entirely, and to have been without reproof as to that, but he was faulty, not only because he ordain'd *Arian* Priests, but also, in that he freely communicated with them : and for this reason none of the Inhabitants of *Rome* would come into the Church, whilst he was there, but peremptorily refused communion with him.

\* *Athanas. Ep.*

*ad solitar*

p. 837.

Ανα καὶ τὸ το  
δείκνυσιν ὅτι  
κείνων ὑπὸ τὴν  
βίαν, ληθεύει  
τὸ καλὰ θ' αἰ-  
ετῶσαι μῖσος,  
καὶ τὸ ὑπερ ἁθὰ  
δύσει ἡ πόρις  
ὅτι τὴν πρὸς  
ἀρετὴν ἔχον  
ἐὰν δεῖται.

The last Paragraph occasions a doubt to arise, which requires a Solution, even for *Liberius's* reputation, and the Believers that had been his Adherents : for it is well known that after two years exile, *Liberius* was \* over-ruled to subscribe to *Athanasius's* condemnation : and though it abundantly argued the Eusebians force, and his own hatred of the Heresie, and his suffrage for *Athanasius*, when he had his choice free. And I have above shew'd, that he did not go far as to submit to *Felix's* Person, whilst he was in his Chair, yet he herein visibly own'd their falsely assumed Power, and did partake of their Schism in so doing, and since the Historical Account, which we have of this Affair, does

does make it probably, at least, appear, that the Believers at *Rome* did immediately communicate with *Liberius*, upon his return, and, consequent'y, in his polluted State, what could they incur less, then the same Schism? And why may they not as well have communicated with *Felix*? Or how could they be less peccant in it? It being a certain Rule in the Church, that if a Bishop breaks the rightful Succession, by invading a full See, as *Majorinus* did, when he came into *Cecilianus's* Chair at *Carthage*, and if one legally possessed of a See, and, so far, no violator of Church-Unity, shall, notwithstanding, give to the Usurper his Letters of Peace, and communicate with him, as *Marcian*, Bishop of *Arles*, in *St. Cyprian's* Epistles, did to the *Novatian* Bishops, who had usurped upon *Carthage*, and broke the Church's Succession, in the same manner *Majorinus*, and the *Donatists*, did afterwards, and if a People communicate with such, they therein joyn with them in their Schism, and the Bishops, and Believers, contract its guilt upon their Souls, and the Church hath still markt them for Schismatics, and shun'd them.

Now, as to the thing it self, \* *Baronius* vindicates them, and tells us, that, upon *Liberius's* return, he found a great many of the Catholics to have fallen off from him, because he communicated with the Arians, and to have receiv'd *Felix* as their lawful Bishop, believing *Liberius's* right to be extinct, by reason of his fall, and since *Felix*, was not an Arian, and was not then in a full See, his Title was good, and they were not Schismatics in receiving him: and, farther, that a Persecution was rais'd upon them, because, in receiving *Felix*, they disobey'd the Imperial Letters, which commanded *Liberius's* restitution, and *Felix* continued the lawful Bishop, till his death, which he is inclinable to believe to have been eight years, according to *Marcellinus*, whom he cites to that purpose †, but not daring to take this Schismatics single authority for it, thinking, no doubt, his own as good, he concludes it to have been but one year, three months, and three days, and after *Felix's* death, *Liberius*, rejecting the Arian Communion, was receiv'd, and, upon his satisfaction and pardon, and his confirmation of *Felix's* ordinations, they were all united, and the Church had peace. So from this account, it is plain, that here was no Communion held with any Bishop, that was Schismatical, and a Possessor only, after *Liberius's* subscription: For, upon his becoming Arian, he lost his Right, and the People thereupon justly deserted him: and since he had none, *Felix's* Title, upon his Possession, was good, and they did not receive *Liberius*.

\* An. 357.  
Num. 56, 57,  
60, 66, 70.

† Prefat. ad  
Libel precum.

upon *Felix's* death, till he made satisfaction : and Dr. *Hody* goes along with the Cardinal, as to the main, but differs from him in that he will have *Liberius*, deprived for a time by reason of his *Arianism*. But alas! though, in some things, this Narrative seems to help the Doctor out, and he is known to catch at every Bulrush to help himself, what else but a *Romance* is all of it? And it hath not only, no foundation in authentick History, but no footsteps there: and as the Doctor has no other then \* *Baronius's* authority on his side, (even the two Presbyters in their *Preface*, overthrow the substantial part of it) so *Baronius* produceth only some *Apocryphal* lives of their Popes for it, in which there will not be any such thing found neither, without the help of the *Cardinal's* conjecture, which usually, takes a great Liberty.

Besides, how were the Catholicks less Schismaticks in deserting *Liberius*, upon his subscribing, and communicating with the *Arians*, (if he did so,) then in receiving *Felix*, and communicating with him (which the Cardinal and the Doctor suppose) who is own'd, by all, to have communicated with the *Arians*, since both were Orthodox? Though the Doctor takes a strange liberty, and says that *Liberius* was an *Arian*, and therein differs from the Cardinal. But, I shall shew his precariousness in it anon.

But to leave the Cardinal and the Doctor in the enjoyment of their own imaginations, and speak briefly, but home, to the matter : our Histories are short here, as they are in many other cases, and do not give us any account of *Liberius* and the Believers at *Rome*, from the time that they petition'd *Constantius* for his return, untill he actually repossessed his Chair, and exercised his Function among them, save that they rejected *Felix*, in that interval, so we are altogether ignorant of the manner and degrees of *Liberius's* repentance, upon his subscription against *Athanasius* and coming into the *Eusebians*, as also of the manner, and time in which the People receiv'd and recognized him. Yet we are not to doubt but that it was done upon his satisfaction, (not in order to his second enthronization, upon the death of *Felix*, whom they fancy to have died the lawful and Catholick Bishop of *Rome*) whereby he was restor'd to the Church's Unity, from which his lapse broke him off, and the Believers Communion with him was legitimated. Some high *Romanist* Zealots, who receive the Council of *Simuessu*, will possibly tell us, from the example of Pope \* *Marcellinus*, upon his Idolatry, that *Libe-*  
*rius*,

\* *Ibid. supra.*  
*Num. 72.*

† *Baron.*  
*An. 32.*  
*Num. 83. &c.*

rius, being the Supream Head of the Church, and no inferior was capable of doing it, he penanced himself. And St. \* *Austin* \* Ep. 106. seems to be of an opinion that a Bishop of *Rome* is not to be subject to the Rules of common Penitents. But Doctor † *Hody* † P. 49. l. 1. allows the thing it self, and so far subjects him to the Church as to say, that upon his Restoration, he received pardon from her, though we have surer authority for it. We may not believe, that since the Church Rules and practice from the beginning, do not permit a lapsed Bishop to be received, but upon satisfaction, these Believers at *Rome* on the one hand, or this eminent and most exemplary Bishop, (all along save in this one matter of subscription) on the other hand, would have rennited as Pastor and People, and not in a thorow compliance to those Rules and Practice. Neither doth *Baronius's* || suggestion seem to be ill || An. 357. grounded, which is, that even *Felix's* Party came in to *Liberius*, Num. 70. because *Felix's* succession sunk, and there was no care taken to ordain his Successor. For nothing can give a greater blow to a Sect then its remissness in that nature, especially when the succession of Pastors is not continued. We gain this much also beyond a contradiction, that a Bishop's Schismatical Communion, and lapse upon it, was not, in those days, concluded to forfeit his Orders, but he was receiv'd, if there was no other bar, into Communion, and into his See, without a new Consecration. No one suspects *Liberius* to have had one, neither would the Laws of the Church have endured such a thing.

## S E C T. VII.

**A**ND thus, if I mistake not, I have made good that which I promised, upon my entrance on the former Section, and do verily perswade my self that such as give themselves a full liberty of thinking, and consider the Premises therein contain'd, and the bottom on which they stand, will readily yield that the advantages from *Liberius* and *Felix* are on our side, and not on the Doctors, and that their whole story is so far from proving the forced absence of a Bishop from his See and People, whether it be by exile or an unjust Deprivation; to legitimate a Successor, though he be otherwise Orthodox, that all the argument it affords is on the contrary. I know the Doctor has farther pleas in *Felix's* behalf. And I now undertake an inquiry into them, following not my own, but his methods throughout his whole Chapter. And,

1. The



\* P. 42.

1. The Doctor is altogether precarious when he \* tells us, that *the much greater number of the Laity of Rome rejected Felix, because though he was really Orthodox, they were not satisfied in it, but being ordain'd by the Arians, he was thought to favour that Party*: all our accounts which pretend to be ancient mentioning no such thing, save only that in some Copies of St. Jerome de *† scriptoribus Ecclesiasticis* it is said, *Felix the Arian*. But Sossyrius's Greek translation hath left it out, and so have the Ancient Copies which St. Jerome has || followed in his *Chronicon*. But the Doctor is shameless in the Authorities which he produces in his Proofs. For,

† In Acacio.

|| Baron.  
An. 355.  
Num. 55.

\* Supra. l. 2.  
c. 17.

1. *Theodorit* lays expressly, that they knew *Felix* had kept the *Nicene Faith* entirely at the same time, when they would not go into the Church with him, nor whilst he was in it. Was it then because they suspected his Orthodoxy in the Faith? Or could they in this conjuncture mean any thing else, when they pleaded, that they could not communicate with him, because he communicated with the *Arians*, then that he joyn'd with them in their unlawful Successions; for these two were the only Points that could then fall under debate, viz. the Schism and the Heresie: but they did not think *Felix* to be an *Arian*. Again, when the Emperor recommended *Felix* and *Liberius* unto them, and requir'd them to receive both as joynt Bishops of the City, did these *Romans*, that refused *Felix*, except against his Faith as the reason of it? Or make any scruple relating to it? Was it not for this reason they rejected him, viz. because they must then receive him in a full See, by reason of *Liberius's* incompetent Deprivation, which they could not comply with, being obliged to have, as but *one God one Christ*, so one Bishop, in a City? And nothing is more sure then that which the Doctor secures himself to have gain'd from *Theodorit's Testimony*, viz. that *they would not have refused, if he had not communicated with Heretics*, i. e. if he had not united in worship with the *Arian Bishops*, it being here, to be sure, capable of no other sense, since he did not communicate with them in their Heterodoxy of Faith.

2. Would any man, that did not only design to fill the Margin, without consulting his reputation any farther, have insisted on the authority of *Freculfus*, who wrote in the Ninth Century, to prove matter of fact in the Fourth, and at the same time grant that he *did not write it from some ancient Historians*? But, his inference

Ibid.

rence which he makes from *Freculfus's* conjecture (for he owns it to be no more) is prodigious. As, that it thence appears, *that he did not think there was any other good reason for which they might separate from Felix.* But why might not a rational man think, that, though he was not an Heretick, yet, if he was a Schismatick, they might, for that reason, separate from him, especially, since the Principles of Christianity will bear them out in it? Or, what if a Bishop be no Heretick but Sodomitical, Simonaical, &c. Will his Orthodoxy in Faith compound for them all? The Doctor has declar'd himself to be of another opinion, but it was to serve a turn, and so it is now, of which I have already given \* an account, and after all, *Freculfus* is most probably abus'd by the Doctor, and he injuriously interprets his Original Words. For, why by *Heretick* (when he says, *they declin'd the Communion of Felix as such*) must he mean an *Arian*? Since the *Eusebian* Schismatics are all along, called *Arians* by the Ancients, and their *Arianism* was generally interpreted to amount to no more than their receiving a false Succession of Bishops, and that was one reason, at least, why the *Athanasians* refused to communicate with them. Neither may we suspect that *Freculfus* was ignorant of it: Since he wrote a judicious *Chronicon* from *Adam*, till about the sixth Century:

\*Cap. I. S. 3.

3. But *Athanasius* † is manifestly abused by him, and if he says † *Ep. ad sol-* any thing to the Doctors purpose it is too much, and overthrows *tar. p. 861.* his whole Plot. For *Athanasius* tells us, *ὅτι ὁ δὲ πᾶντες*, all the People of Rome, not the greater number, were aware of their Heresie. And more, [ἐπίστευεν] that they knew it: they did more then suspect it. And the Doctor || confesseth as much in the next || P. 43. l. 3, 4, Lines, in his own translation of *Athanasius*, though in the following Line he represents *Athanasius* to have only thought *Felix* an *Heretick*. And he is so bold with him as to impute his mistake to his ignorance, which, says he, is not at all to be wonder'd at, for he knew nothing of him, and had never heard of him, but as put in by the *Arians* into *Liberius's* place. But, can we wonder enough at the Doctor's lessening Character of the great *Alexandrian* Prelate, in which he is represented so very ignorant, as not to know what sort of man he was that usurp'd his great Friend *Liberius's* See for two whole years, and whether *Felix* was an *Arian* or not, even, at the same time when the whole World quitted him of it? And, after all, if *Athanasius* was not so ignorant as not to know certainly whether *Felix* was an Here-

tick, i. e. an *Eunomian Arian*, or not, nothing can be more plain, then that the *Heretical Pravity*, *παρανομία*, from which he tells us, the Catholicks here separated, related only to the Episcopal *Succession*, for the violation of which the *Eusebians* are still called Hereticks by him; and by our Ecclesiastical Writers. And the instances of it which *Athanasius* produces, do irrefragably make it good. As, of *Gregory* and *George*, who were brought into the Chair of *Alexandria* upon himself: in *Auxentius*, who was brought into *Millane*, upon *Dionysius*: in the ejection of *Lucifer*, *Paulinus*, and *Eusebius*, by *Constantius's* arbitrary and single authority. And lastly, Which comes up to our very Point, in the instance of *Epiphanius*, who introduced *Felix* into *Liberius's* See at *Rome* by his Commission from the Empire, and created him *Bishop*, in the *Palace*, upon which *Athanasius* immediately makes this exclamation, *what hath he here omitted which belongs to Antichrist?* So that the Hereticks here are those who enthron'd and adher'd to *Felix*, and they are *Antichrists* into the bargain. So miserably is the Doctor mistaken in this authority.

2. One would wonder what advantage he proposes to himself and to *Felix's* Title against *Liberius*, from the Oath that all the Clergy took, obliging themselves by it not to accept of any other Bishop, whilst *Liberius* was living, especially since this is the only thing he concludes from it, viz. that the Principles of those Times did void *Liberius's* See upon his secular *Deprivation* and *Expulsion* from *Rome*, and did justify the reception of another into his Chair, for, otherwise, according to his own sense of the thing, what needed they to have taken that Oath? But, I rejoyce, does no man then take an Oath to maintain an antecedent indefeasible Right? Does our Oath of Canonical Obedience imply that our Bishops have no other Right over us, then that which the Oath gives them? We have been often told, that it obliges no longer then the Right remains, for the Defence of which we took it, but Doctor *Hody*, surely, is the first man that hath said it supposes no right, nay, that it excludes it, and the Principles of those times (unless he means his elder Brethren's, the time-serving *Eusebians*) did certainly teach them otherwise. But, especially, that a secular proscription did not void a See, and make way for a Successor, whether *Liberius's* Clergy knew it or not: if they did not, their ignorance is not to be our president.

3. That which the Doctor pleads in behalf of the Roman Clergy

*Athanas. ibid.*  
*supra.* p. 860,  
861, 862.  
Ἐπίσκοπον ἐν  
τῷ παλατίῳ  
ἐποίησαν.

P. 43.  
P. 44.

*ibid.*

Clergy, who deserted *Liberius*, and constituted *Felix* their Bishop, viz. because *Liberius*, in the time of his banishment, had subscribed to the *Arians*, and they lookt upon him as no longer a lawful Bishop; this has a good bottom in it-self. And also that which he farther says, to this effect; as, that 'tis Orthodoxy we are to have regard to. Our love to our Bishop is not to be inferior to our Love to the Church. And our Oaths and Relations, in which we stand oblig'd to him, are all for the security of the Orthodox Faith. For, if our Bishop be an Heretick, and indispenfably makes the Heresie the Terms of Communion with him, we are to separate, and not to accept them. For this we have instances of as eminent Bishops as Christendom has had; as, *Athanasius*, *Hilary*, *Eusebius* of *Samosata*, *Lucifer* of *Sardinia*, &c. who were banish'd into remote Districts under *Eusebian* and *Aetian* Bishops, and they erected there their own Churches a part from them: Of which I have already \* given an account. And the parity of reason is the same, and will equally reach those Clergy men, who call a Bishop into a full District, to preside there and exercise his function in the same manner, if their, otherwise, proper Bishop shall impose the same terms upon them, and indefeasibly, which the forementioned *Arian* Bishops did, upon those Prelates. But then, Doctor *Hody's* application of these Rules to the *Roman* Clergy and *Liberius's* case, is as false as any thing is true, all agreeing that *Liberius* only subscrib'd the first *Sirmian* Creed, and he consequently, could be no Heretick in the judgment of the Church, which quitted that Creed of Heresie: Even † *Athanasius* and ‖ *Hilary* have done it. And tho' the Doctor will have it, that these two last have thought otherwise in some places of their works, which he has produced to that purpose, with the authorities of *St. Jerome* and *Sozomen*, those places will be found either false quoted, or to have a wrong sense put upon them. \* *Athanasius* says expressly, ( what ever it was that *Liberius* subscrib'd unto ) he subscrib'd through force, and retain'd his first sentiments entire: and we have just now prov'd that he entred upon his government immediatly upon his return; and that the Catholics receiv'd him, and communicated under him. And we may easily farther think, that he as soon declar'd the force, and asserted his Catholicism, and made satisfaction for his Errors, upon Church grounds, without which he is not to be imagined to have been receiv'd. And since he stood upon the same foot of Orthodoxy, the Doctor supposes *Felix*

Ibid.

† Cap. 1. Sect. 3.

† De Synod. p. 9.  
‖ De Synod.\* Ep. ad Solitar.  
p. 837.

to have done, and was replac'd on his Throne by the Empire, and *Felix* reject'd, if the Clergy, upon the Doctor's principles, believ'd themselves in Conscience bound to submit to the *Possessor*, being Orthodox; they cannot be suppos'd to have chose the latter and reject'd the former, but, on the contrary, to have receiv'd *Liberius* and quitted *Felix*; unless they openly violated the Prince's Right and their own Consciences.

Tho', after all there is not one word of this affects our present case; for, if *Liberius* did, at last, become an Heretick, and was reject'd by the Catholicks upon it, the Doctor has own'd that he was Orthodox at the time of his Deprivation, and two years after. And since the same Catholicks, whom he supposes to have reject'd *Liberius* for his Heresie, and not to have receiv'd him until he had retract'd it, did adhere to him whilst he was Orthodox, notwithstanding his *Secular Deprivation*, it thence directly follows, that *Liberius's* Secular Deprivation was not a competent ground, in it self, for a people's Translation of their allegiance, during a Bishop's Orthodoxy. And their after rejecting *Liberius*, as an Heretick, if such a thing was done, will only to far justify the Doctor's design, and vindicate the present *Vacancy of our Sees by an unjust and uncanonical Deprivation*, as they can prove our respective deprived Bishops to have been Heretical likewise: which none pretends, nor can ever do.

It will be objected, that *Constantius* would not have permitted *Liberius* to return and reassume his See, unless *Liberius* had, not only subscrib'd to *Arianism*, but, continued a Professor, and Propugner of it, according to his power, since he was exil'd, and depriv'd, partly, because he refused to do it, and *Constantius*, otherwise, would have been defeated of his design, which he never sincerely quitted, but continu'd in truth a rigid *Exoukrontian*, and irreconcilable opposer of the *Nicene Article*. But our Histories, as I have already observ'd, speak very imperfectly of this affair, if they be not altogether silent. And since all the account they give of *Liberius* after his return, is, that he was a \* zealous *Anti Aetian*, and also *Anti-Eusebian Arian*, until his death. We are to look upon *Constantius's* indulgence to him as the work of God, who can turn the hearts of Kings at his pleasure, in that the lawful Succession was restor'd, and Truth and Unity, in some measure, together with it, in the midst of that naughty Generation, through the Faith and Courage of the Believers; whose constancy to their duty to their

\* See Socrat.

l. 4. c. 11.

Soz. l. 6. c. 10,

11.



their lawful Bishop, was a secundary means, by which it was effected, and they remain a beauteous example to posterity in the like case. And we may hence strengthen our expectations of the same mercy, that tho' our Pastors be hid from our eyes for a time, they shall be restor'd as at the beginning, if we, through want of Faith, and our just endeavours, do not desert them, and God, in his wrath, does not put a final bar to their return. Surely a truer sense of duty to an exil'd Bishop has not appear'd, then in these *Roman* Christians, for their Bishop *Liberius*, according to the account which all Historians give of it : Tho' Doctor *Hody* is so unfortunate as to make them one of his *Protes*, or *Presidents*, for the warranting our practice, in receiving every unjust and uncanonical Deprivation, and Successor, if he be *Orthodox*. I will add,

4. That the Doctor keeps true to his wide arguings, when he would have us believe it to be imply'd, that *because the Clergy of Rome had a regard to Orthodoxy and the Faith, in their Oath which they took to be true to Liberius, upon his departure, and thereby engag'd themselves to accept no other Bishop as long as he should live, that was likely to destroy the Faith, they, therefore, did not engage themselves unto him by it, that they would not receive another upon his unjust and uncanonical Deprivation.* For, surely, the Oath, and its engagement, might take in both considerations : And why it did not, especially, since *Athanasius's* and other Deprivations that were unjust and uncanonical are known to have put a bar to their Successors : Doctor *Hody* may, possibly, be the man that is able to give an account. But thus he will argue all along ; as because the Catholics did refuse to communicate with particular Bishops that were *Excommunicants*, therefore these Bishops Lay and forcible Rights to their Sees were not also a just ground for those Catholics to separate from them : the *Roman* Clergy bound themselves by Oath that they would not receive an Heretick into *Liberius's* See ; and for that reason they did not oblige themselves, by the same Oath, that they would not receive an intruding Schismatick upon him : Besides, the Doctor \* tells us, that upon *Liberius's* return, and the *Felicians's* coming into him, he pardon'd them for breaking their Oath, (tho' he would have it call'd by another name) and they pardon'd him for his Apostacy. And I thus argue upon him *ex ore suo*, that their Oath could not relate solely to the true Faith, and to nothing else, because then they would not have wanted a pardon, since their

\* P. 45. line 2.

their bringing in *Felix* upon him made no change in the Faith, nor any violation of their Oath, as to that. Neither can they be conceiv'd to have obliged themselves by this Oath, but only upon Church principles, as *knowing that who soever was put upon him would be a true Bishop, and the principles of those times did not oblige them to think otherwise.* And it was their duty upon, *Felix's* coming to the Chair, as a *Succesor*, to receive him. So then, their breaking that first part of the Oath, which related to *Liberius*, was so far from wanting a pardon either, that it was their duty to break it, and to disclaim all manner of obligation to *Liberius* by it. It might be their fault in that they took such an Oath, but their breaking of it was their duty, which asks no pardon. A few just thoughts will direct an unprejudiced man thus to conclude, upon the whole matter: *viz.* That, since they broke an Oath, and sinn'd, and wanted pardon for it, it was, in that they brought *Felix* into the Chair at *Rome*, as a lawful Possessor, when it was quite contrary to the principles of the Church, which does not allow of such Possessors, and to their particular obligations, by that Oath, to the contrary. And for this they wanted a pardon at *Liberius's* hand, as he wanted a pardon for his Apostacy. Which breach of Oath is justly call'd their perjury by the two † Presbyters. Tho' the Doctor must be allow'd to be shy in calling it so, because the case comes too near some of his acquaintance.

\* P. 44. line  
3. 6.

† Prefat. ad  
libel precum.

|| P. 45, 46.

\* De Prescript.  
c. 3.

*Quid ergo si Episcopus, si Diaconus, lapsus a regulâ fuit, ideo Hereses veritatem videbantur obtinere? Ex personis probamus Eadem, an ex Fide personas.*

5. What if *Damasus*, who is wont to be call'd the Great, the Pious, and the Orthodox *Damasus*, (and he has five times as many more glorious Titles then the Doctor has reckon'd up,) did believe *Felix* a lawful Bishop, and receive him? *Tertullian's* || Rule abundantly shews the unconclusiveness of such arguings  
*ab autoritate: What then (saith he) if a Bishop, if a Deacon, hath fallen from the Rule, did therefore Heresies seem to obtain the nature of Truth Do we prove the Faith from persons, or persons by the Faith? Did the Catholick Faith and Practice bear out Damasus in that he did?*

The Doctor does not pretend to prove that. Besides, how many bad men are there, that have receiv'd the largest characters from good men, and were thought to deserve them when they were given them, but are their precedeing, or subsequent, vices made patterns for mankind upon it? *Damasus* was a good Pope, and deserv'd well of the Church of God, in the administration of his Function: But  
he

he might be a seditious Deacon, notwithstanding. And, if the two Presbyters, *Marcellinus* and *Faustinus*, and Doctor *Hody* have given a just account of him, he was an ill Deacon. But the Doctor only represents *Damasius* as a good Bishop for an example to Posterity.

6. His argument which he uses a little after in behalf of *Felix*, by which he thinks that he proves him a true Bishop, in that the Catholick Bishops of his own District communicated with him, and receiv'd him as their Metropolitan, is a little more bulky, but labors under the same inward defect with the former. As we are not to prove the Faith by the practice of one single Bishop, so nor by twenty, no nor a greater number, but by no means by an handful of Bishops that once inhabited the *Suburbicarian* Region, or *Roman* District. They have receiv'd a Succession of Bishops, as Universal Monarchs, and Infallible, and they might be mistaken when they receiv'd *Felix*, as a true Bishop, when he was not such. But the Doctor pretends to make it good that he was receiv'd by others, as a lawful Bishop; tho' his authorities for this are not less defective. He first proves it, because there are some Epistles in *Isidore Mercator*, in which *Athanasius*, and a Synod at *Rome*, own'd him as a true Bishop: But since *Isidore* was so ill advis'd as to forge these Epistles, and think the World would receive them as true ones, are we to believe that each matter in them is true, when we have his wretched authority only to avouch it, when he was so unthinking at the same time as to lay two of the Epistles at *Athanasius's* door, who is known to have rejected, and ridicul'd \* *Felix's* title to *Rome* at a great rate, by every one that has read any thing in his works? If there was such a tradition of the Church in *Isidore's* time, it is to be rejected for that reason. Neither is there a better argument to prove the Epistles counterfeit, then in that they make *Felix* the true Bishop of *Rome*, contrary to the principles and practice of the true Church. But the argument is not to be endur'd which concludes *Felix* a true Bishop because *Isidore* said so. Again, his *Pontifical* is not more Authentick, then *Isidore's* Epistles: And the authority it hath, is at last, resolv'd by the Doctor, into the foremention'd Tradition: And he does no more, in effect, then prove the *Pontifical* to be true from the Tradition, and the Tradition to be true from the Pontifical, when both go against that Faith which hath been from the beginning. Farther more, his argument to maintain *Felix* in

p. 49.

\* *Apol. p. 86.*  
or *alibi.*

in

in his Chair, taken from the Miracle which the *Legendary* tells us was done at his Tomb, helps the Doctor on extremely : I see he can have a *Romanist's* Faith when it will ser vehisturn : And he is so much the more precarious herein , since \* *Baronius* own's himself to have been convinced by the same Miracle ; tho' he had wrote a Book before, and prov'd *Felix* a false Bishop. It follows, that *Felix* † ordain'd five Deacons, twelve Presbyters, and eighteen or nineteen Bishops. And what then ? Might he not be a false Bishop for all this ? Did not the *Novatians*, *Meletians*, *Donatists* and *Arians* keep up their Succession by their Ordinations ? Were they therefore true Bishops ? He ades, || our Historians mention how the Laity of Rome refused to communicate with him, but not a word that the Bishops did. I am not concern'd to enquire strictly into the truth of this ; since the merit of our cause does not depend on their compliance, or a greater number of Bishops , if it be done against the Laws and Principles of the Church. I am sorry , if they did not refuse communion with him , but came so notoriously behind the Laity in doing their duty. Tho' I cannot see what the Doctor can hence infer to his advantage, unless it be , that Bishops have laid aside their duty , when they could not otherwise keep their temporalities : It being , in all likelihood , that one consideration which made them comply with *Felix* , according to the *Eusebian* practice at that time. I have already demonstrated that their perjury consisted in receiving a second Bishop, and shall not take further notice of what is \* urged to the contrary. As also when the same is † repeated by the Doctor. For he seems to be more then ordinary careful to wipe off that stain : And it neerly concerns him to do it, though he washes only an *Ethiopian* skin. I will also venture to think, that his Authority from || *Philostorgius* is not worth taking notice of. And go on directly to his next seat of argumentation, where,

7. He contends with a great deal of assurance that *Felix* was own'd by *Liberius* himself as a true Bishop of Rome, because his Ordinations were receiv'd by him as valid : Now, tho' I do not find any authority which vouches this , but that of the two † Presbyters *Fausstinus* and *Marcellinus*, and *Baronius*, and the Doctor : Tho' the learned Cardinal does not pretend one precedent for it : Yet I'll grant it : It being no new thing to find that our Ancient Historians have let slip other things besides this : And what if it be all true ? Did not *Melchisedech*, Bishop of Rome, receive

\* An 357.  
num. 62, 63.

† P. 50.

|| Ibid.

\* P. 51.  
† P. 53.

|| P. 51.

\* P. 47. 51.

† In Libel pre-  
num. 359. num.  
70.

receive the *Donatists* Bishops in their Orders, even those whom *Majorinus* had Ordain'd, upon their coming in and submission to the Catholick Church? But nothing is more certain then that he did not own, at the same time, *Majorinus* to be the lawful Bishop of *Carthage*, and *Cecilianus* to be the Intruder. The Council of *Nicea* receiv'd the *Meletian* Clergy upon the same terms, in their *Conciliary* Epistle to the *Alexandrians*: For, what ever the Council might mean by the *Mystical laying on of hands*, which they receiv'd upon their Admission, we may not think it meant thereby a second Ordination, since we are told that they retain'd their Ecclesiastical degree, and right to Officiate, and lost nothing but their Seniority: And the word *βεβαθύντας*, added to *μυσικατικὰ χειροτονία*, does not imply their receiving new Orders, but a Corroboration of their old ones. To which † *Sozomen* adds, that they were allow'd, to communicate and exercise their Ministry: Neither may we think, that this grant, and their admission to give attendance at the Altar, implies them to have lost their Orders. Now, can the loosest thoughts apprehend that *Meletius* was accepted by the *Nicene* Fathers, and obey'd as the Lawful Bishop of *Alexandria*, because his Ordinations were accepted? Or, (to back it with another-instance) since *Alexander*, into whose *Alexandrian* Diocesis *Meletius* intruded, did, in obedience to the Council's Authority receive those of his Ordaining, is he therefore to be concluded to have received him as rightful Bishop there, in the same manner Doctor *Hody* would have us believe *Liberius* did *Felix*? The Doctor himself dares not say so, upon second thoughts.

I know very well, that, not only some *School-Men*, but other learned Bishops and Doctors have asserted the Ordinations which have been made contrary to the Law of the Church, and in Schism, to be altogether void, and that nothing less than a second Ordination can make amends, and place those persons, who have receiv'd them, in a Sacerdotal station: And there are some who strongly plead, that the Council of *Nicea* is on their side, when \* it thus determines; \* *Car. 9.* viz. that the Catharists or Novarians, which return to the Church, shall be receiv'd by Imposition of hands, and remain among the Clergy. The meaning of which they will have to be, that they shall be Re-ordain'd in order to it: And they ground their opinion upon the word *χειροθεσία*, which is us'd to signify Imposition of hands in Ordination, as well as upon repentance: And believe

\* *Aug. Ep. 152.*† *Socrat. l. 1. c. 6. Theod. H. E. l. 1. c. 11. Μυσικατικὴ χειροτονία.*Τίμωρ ἡ λαο-  
τυγία.† *L. 4. c. 23. Κοινωνεῖν ἡ λαο-  
τυγία.*



it to be used altogether in the former sense, in that Canon. I have consider'd the Canon as well as I could, and must say, that I cannot perswade my self to be of their mind. But whether they are in the right, or in the wrong, the several Doctors different Judgments so far serve us, as to shew the rashness of Doctor *Hody's* inference. If he had first made it appear, that *Liberius* was among these Doctors, who asserted all Ordinations void, that were made by a *second* Bishop, against the Law of the Church, his consequence had then been direct and necessary, viz. that since *Liberius* receiv'd *Felix's* Ordinations as true ones, he did not look upon him as a *second*, but a rightful Bishop : But this he hath neither supposed, nor attempted to prove : though the contrary seems most probable; from the practice of the Church, about that time, which receiv'd the Ordinations which the *Arian* Bishops made, as *Possessors*. But in that he argues, and concludes universally, that *Felix* must have been the true Bishop of *Rome*, because *Liberius* receiv'd his Ordinations, when his receiving them might as well prove the quite contrary, since, for any thing he knows, or has made to appear, *Liberius* was of the opinion that the Ordinations with a *Second* or unlawful Bishop made in Schism, were valid; and it is granted by all to have been a disputed point; nothing can be more manifest then the weakness of his consequence, and his undue assumption : It is to go for a *Hodism* : His Book will be found to be stuffed with inferences of the same alloy. I cannot forbear to say, that I do not remember one concluding argument in it. And that subject neither deserves nor is capable of better, whose main undertaking is to vindicate vacant Sees by unjust and uncanonical Deprivations.

\* P. 52, 53.

8. But \* he adds, that the whole Western Church has all along own'd *Felix*, as one of the true Bishops of *Rome*, This is the better laid medium of the two, but it will not infer his conclusion. For, first, the Western Bishops are but a moiety of the Bishops in the Christian Church; and then, he instances only in such of them as are too modern to prove a point in the fourth Century: (they coming within the tenth or very near it) especially since none before them have done it. But if his citations be true, which I have some reason to suspect, they add but little to the repute of the whole. If *Papebrochius* says true : And the *Martyrologies*, *Breviaries*, &c. do own *Felix* to have been the true Bishop of *Rome*, will they either by sufficient authorities for the

the Doctor in this case? Do not even some of the *Roman Doctors* disown *Felix* as the lawful Bishop of *Rome*, because two Bishops could not be at a time in one City? Besides, there is not one of the Doctors authorities that mentions *Felix*, as a true Bishop of *Rome*, upon any other bottom than a supposed Tradition, which will hardly be of force against a generally receiv'd truth: And, after all, those two Rules in *Tertullian* come so full upon them, that they do not seem to be either escaped, or withstood. \* *Whatsoever* (sayth he)

*savours contrary to truth, this is Heresie, tho' it be an old Custom. That which is afterwards induced, shall be esteemed Heresie, in the same measure, as that which was delivered in times past, and from the beginning, shall be accounted truth.*

\* *Quodcumque adversus veritatem sapit, hac erit Heresis, etiam vetus consuetudo; † In tantum enim Heresis deputabitur, quod postea introduciatur; in quantum veritas habebitur, quod retro a primordio traditum est.*

\* *De Veland, virginibus c. 1. † l. 1. adv. marc. c. 1.*

9. Well! But he farther \* saith, that *Felix* is likewise own'd \* P. 53. for a true Pope, in the Eastern Church by *Nicephorus* the Patriarch of Constantinople, who flourish'd in the year 806. and that too tho' *Nicephorus* well knew, that he came in the place of *Liberius*, when *Liberius* was unjustly depos'd, by the Emperor, *ifœdais* and *corvus* *asquarū*, as in his Chronology. And, as *Liberius* is reckon'd up the 25. Bishop of *Rome*, so our *Felix*, is call'd the 36. true; he ought to be call'd our, i. e. his *Felix*, as a fit Bishop for him, who writes himself *R. Rmo. in Christo Patri ac Dno. Dno. Joanni Archiep. Cantuar. a Sacris Domest.* I do not in the least question, but he would have been a *Sacris Domest.* to *Felix* at *Rome*, if he had been of the same time, and could have obtain'd the honour to have assisted him in his *Arian* Ordinations, as he hath done *John* at *Lambeth*, if that had been as consistent with his interest at *Rome*, as this was with his interest at *Lambeth*, and as likely a way to obtain two fat Benefices, with as many Dignities of the same quality, and, in due time, an *Eusebian* prize, i. e. a good Bishoprick. Nor do I question but that he would have deserted *Felix* too, upon his abdication, that afterward follow'd by *Constantine*, as his *Damasus* (for we will not envy him the having both of them for his own) deserted *Liberius*, when the same Secular Hand depriv'd him, and that the Doctor would have believ'd himself as little guilty of perjury for it, as he thinks *Damasus* was, notwithstanding his Oath of canonical Obedience. *Felix's* title at *Rome*, and Doctor *Til—n's* at *Lambeth*, were so much the same, that he who could recognize the one,

might, for the same reason, recognize the other : Both were enthron'd by the same secular arm, when that same arm had remov'd their Predecessors, without the advice and concurrence of the Colledge of Bishops, or laying treason, or a Church forfeiture, to their Charge, *cum locus Fabiani, & locus Sacerdotalis non vacaret*, but the rightful Bishops were alive, and fill'd their Sees at the same time. Neither will it ( tho' the Doctor is of another opinion ) in the least advantage *Felix's* title, nor, by consequence, Doctor *Til——n's*, in that *Nicephorus* has left him and *Liberius* upon record, in his *Chronology*, as Bishops of Rome, and *Felix, Liberius's* Successor, upon *Liberius's* abdication by *Constantius*. For tho' this *Nicephorus*, Bishop of Constantinople, is of more authority then *Nicephorus Calisti*, the sam'd Ecclesiastical Historian; yet his credit is not such, as to conclude the whole Greek Church : besides, the Doctor owns that he did not write his *Chronology* till the beginning of the ninth Century : but that which we are chiefly to consider is, that *Chronologers*, in making their Tables, have a respect only to matter of Fact, and set down the Successors, as they find them in possession, without a regard to their Right : and we are to make use of them for that purpose only, and to take from them the Successions; but the truth of their Titles, if contested, are to be prov'd otherways. And, accordingly, not only the Chronologers of the Reformation, but of the Church of Rome, set down in their Successions, or rather Possessions, all the Antipopes, together with the true ones; even *Constantine* and *Formosus*. For his satisfaction, as to the truth of which, I will at present, desire the Reader to consult *Labbee's* account of the Bishops of Rome, which he will find in the end of his *Dissertatio Historica, de Scriptoribus Ecclesiasticis, pars secunda* : but neither the Roman Church nor any else have thought *Constantine* and *Formosus* to be better or truer Popes for it.

## S E C T. VIII.

I Should now have done with the Reign of *Constantius*, did not one more remarkable passage occur in it which I may not omit. It is this, according to the account which *Theodorus* gives of it, in his Ecclesiastical History. Eudoxius the Arian Possessor, being remov'd from the See of Antioch to Constantinople, the Arians elected Meletius for their Bishop at Antioch, and Eusebius Samosa-

\* *Liberius ex-*  
*terminatus a*  
*Constantio Ari-*  
*ano. An 6. Fel.*  
*an. 1. ed. Anto-*  
*nii Comiti Pa-*  
*ris. 1573.*

*Labbe de scrip-*  
*toribus ecclesi-*  
*asticis*

\* *L. 2. c. 31, 32.*

Samosatensis, (being there at that time) together with the Catholics of the City, concurr'd with them in it, the former concluding Melerius to be of their Party, for which they had then some bottom : But Eusebius and the Catholics, were abundantly satisfied of his adherence to the Doctrine of the Eternal Generation : and both designing to serve themselves by him, and to make use of one another in order to it, they appointed a Decree for his admission and entronization to be drawn up, and having universally, and unanimously, subscrib'd it, it was by a common vote deposited in the hands of the great and eminently upright Eusebius Samosatensis, as an approv'd Register, for its preservation, whose fidelity will abundantly appear by and by. For, upon Meletius's coming to Antioch, and possessing himself of that See, by virtue of the Bishops Institution, and with the leave of Constantius, he immediately declar'd himself an Homoeousian, and asserted the Eternal Generation, and the Trinity in Unity, in a Sermon in the great Church, on Prov. 8. 22. The Lord possessed me in the beginning, of his ways before his works of old : the Sermon is at large in Epirphanius\*, and well worth a serious perusal. Upon this, Constantius and his Arians were greatly provok'd and incens'd against him, and their zeal was not less for his removal then it had been for his entronization : in order to which, it being found necessary that their Decree which plac'd and confirm'd Meletius in the See, should be openly cassated and null'd, otherwise it might remain in force against them, and be a bar to their Election of another Bishop, because it shew'd the Chair to be full (for a Supersemination was not acceptable) but this could not be done until Eusebius had deliver'd the Decree into their hands. For these considerations, I say, Constantius immediately sent away a Messenger to Eusebius, with his Royal Commands, that he should deliver the Decree : to whom Eusebius replied, that he could not deliver up the common Decree, with which he had been publicly entrusted, without the common consent of those of his own Faith, who, as one man, had committed it to him. The Emperor being highly incens'd against him for such his answer, sends the Messenger back unto him with authority to demand the Decree, and if he persisted in his refusal, to cut off his right-hand : but the most holy Bishop was so far from being fear'd and overaw'd to all against his conscience, that when the Messenger declar'd the Emperors pleasure, he reach'd forth, not only his right hand, but his left, and bad him out of back, saying, I will not deliver the Decree which is so full a conviction of the Arian impiety, by reason of which greatness and constancy of mind, the Emperor, being informed of it, much admir'd and commended him. For

\* Adv. Hæres.  
l. 3. Tom. 2.  
p. 28.

eremian.

enemies are wont to admire the eminent virtues of their adversaries, being compell'd to it by their great action: As our Historian there well observes. And from the whole I shall take notice.

1. That a double, or *second* Election, and fixation in one and the same Chair, whilst the Person, first elected and fixed there, is alive, and not remov'd by his own consent, resignation, or some other due way, which the known Rules of the Church allow of; this proceeding (I say) was so very foul in those days, that the very *Arians* did shrink in upon it, and knew not how to submit into it: though \* *Theodoret* gives this Character of them, that they readily broke every Law to establish their impiety. And that the transgression of the Laws is the foundation of their blasphemy. And though they afterwards elected *Euzoios* into *Melchius's* Chair, and their Decree to the contrary was not deliver'd back unto them, it was not done to their own ease and satisfaction, it

\* C. 31.  
ibid. supra.

ἡ βασιλικὴ οὐκ ἔστι  
ἐκείνη.

Cap. 32.  
Ibid.

Τὸν ἡγεμόνα  
βασιλικὸν ὡς  
ἐκείνου.

remaining a manifest redargution of their haughty Hearts and Actions: For which reason *Eusebius* did not deliver it into their hands, because thereby they would have had an opportunity to extinguish it; but rather chose to undergo the wrath and cruelty of *Constantius*: themselves were not less sensible of it, apprehending it to be conviction upon them of their injustice. And, if the want of a legal cancelling their first Votes, and Decree upon them, had not been a bar to their succeeding Election, nor laid it under the scandal of bringing a Bishop upon a full See, what was it could hinder *Eusebius*, but that he might have surrendred his Paper? Or what needed the *Arians* to have been so urgent in demanding it? The one sure, is not to be conceiv'd, otherwise, to have expos'd himself to such mighty Sufferings, nor the other to have undergone, so much solicitude and trouble, as they did; and both he and they to have been so ill advis'd in the carriage of that affair. Much less may we think *Constantius* would have sent his Messenger twice, and such menaces along with him, concerning it; if there had not been a real purpose in it, and the effects had not been answerable: but thus it hath always been: and those evilmen who do not boggle to tread on the necks of Laws, when to serve their own turn, will choose rather to keep them, and have the advantage of them, if it be consistent with their own project, and their design will be better managed by a compliance with them. It is hence also evident, that the quitting a right by cession, resignation, or the legal





Presbyter and Deacon, that it is their own treachery alone, can betray and surrender them. The Arm of the most Potent cannot snatch and extort them from them, unless their Wills concur, and, in their Persons, they become assistants to him in it: And as it is their honour, so it ought to be their care, and earnest Prayers, that they be found faithful. Again, the same Wisdom of Christ our Saviour hath so order'd his Oeconomy, and disposal of those Church Gifts, that if his Priests, with whom they are lodg'd, should make a general Apostacy, and surrender, or rather, acquit and devert themselves of them, nothing less than a new Feast of Pentecost can restore and resettle them: The Edicts of Princes and Senates would be found insignificant in it; it would be their presumption, and their sin to attempt it. We are not then, to wonder that St. Paul so earnestly and solicitously advises *Timothy* in these

\* 1 Tim. 6. 20. words, *O Timothee, depositum Custodi.* \* O *Timothy*, keep that good thing which is committed to thy trust. And that he repeats and reinforces

† 2 Tim. 1. 14. it in more words, but to the same effect: *that good thing which was committed to thee, keep by the Holy Ghost, which dwelleth in us.*

By which command we are not to doubt but that *Eusebius* was influenced: it reaching farther, in its design then to *Timothy's* Person: neither may any one that duly consults the two Epistles, restrain that injunction to Doctrinals only. Surely, *Timothy's* care of the Church, and due behaviour in it, in respect of the ruling part, and succession of the Bishops, is thence expected. It is most sure, that the trust which *Samosatenensis*, so conscientiously preserved, was *Meletius's* lawful right to the See at *Antioch*; in the keeping of which he was no less solicitous and conscientious, then he was to keep the *Nicene* Article of the the External Generation. This is the Character which the two Emperors, *Valentinian* and *Valens*, give of the *Homoousian* Christians, in their Epistle to the *Asian* Diocess, in *Theodorix's* Church History. *They do not* (saith he) *refuse to pay tribute according to the Laws; they do not oppose the Imperial Power, but holily and sincerely observe, as well our Laws, as the Commands of the great God and King.* *Valens* had not at this time commenced his persecution, but he had seen those holy Bishops thoroughly try'd, and *Eusebius Samosatensis* in particular, in the Reigns of *Constantius* and *Julian*; and found them, afterwards, the same in his own Reign, in which he gave them farther great tryals: their *Active* and *Passive Obedience* was abundantly demonstrated to his

now

|| L. 4. c. 7.

own Eyes, and the Senses of the whole World. Now *Eusebius* did not comply with *Constantine's* (notwithstanding the forementioned Imperial Charact<sup>r</sup> of him) but without his commands and threats, and refused to deliver up the *Credentials*, and the Church Rights with them, though he had before obey'd his other Edicts, and deliver'd up the Temporalities of his Bishoprick into his hands, together with his Person, to be dispos'd of at his Royal Pleasure; of which I have already given an account, and it is hence very plain, that the Civil and Spiritual Powers were two distinct things, in the Sense of the then Emperor; and the retaining the Spiritual, though against the Will of the Prince, was not reputed to be a breach of the former. Again, since *Eusebius* did not comply with *Constantine's* Commands, and deliver the Church *Credentials*, it can be imputed only to his just Sense of Duty to his God, which, even in our present instance of it, those Ancients believed themselves equally, nay antecedently bound to have a regard unto, as well as to their Duty to their Prince. The good Bishop justly apprehending, that his contributing, in the delivery of the Schedule, to the Settlement of *Eusebius*, in the full See of *Antioch*, *Meletius* being then alive, and not remov'd upon Church Terms, would be a Violation of the Law of God, Nothing else being supposable, upon the known Principles of that Age, and the Principles of the true Church in all Ages, to have with-held him from obedience to *Constantine's* commands, requiring his surrender of the Papers, and the same considerations only could justify him in it to the Christian World.

Thus God's great and infinite goodness to his Church has rais'd up men in all ages, who have asserted and maintain'd her Rights, upon every Emergency, even before Kings, who have sometimes endeavour'd to erase and sink them. But we have more eminent Examples of this Nature, over and above this of *Eusebius*, in the Reign of *Constantine*, which was almost all over a Persecution: As, *Athanasius* of *Alexandria*, *Eustathius* and *Meletius* of *Antioch*, *Paulus* of *Constantinople*, *Paulinus* of *France*, *Eusebius* of *Vercellis*, *Dionysius* of *Italy*, *Lucifer*, of *Sardinia*, *Hilary* of *Poitiers*, *Hosius* of *Corduba*, *Liberius* of *Rome*, which two last were highly serviceable after their lapses, upon their true repentance, as well as in their labours and sufferings, whilst they stood. *Baronius* † says, that there were twenty in the Synod of *Ariminum*, which adher'd to the true Faith, and thereby preserv'd the rightful Succession, and Orthodox Doctrine.

2 Tim. 1:12

And the same mercy of God will always preserve a company of true Israelites to be partakers of the assistance of the Gospel, according to the Power of God, and assert his Truths, and his Churches Rights, in performing their Trusts, under the like Emergencies: being persuaded, as St. Paul was, that God is able to keep that good thing which is committed unto them against that day. And that he will be with them always unto the end of the World. Whole Godliness is not placed in the Gain, and little poor concerns in this Life. Who expect no other recompence here but the Blessings and Peace of a good Conscience, and that *Engage bene serve, well done good and faithful Servants, at the appearing of our Lord Jesus Christ, which in his times he shall see, who is the blessed and only Potentate, the King of Kings and Lord of Lords, who only hath immortality, dwelling in that Light which no man can approach unto, whom no man hath seen, or seen See to whom be Power everlasting. Amen.*

**F I N I S.**

